

# **U.S. – Latin American Relations**





**Basic American Documents**

S e r i e s   E d i t o r   A n d r z e j   M a n i a

# **U.S. – Latin American Relations**

Karol Derwich

Jagiellonian University Press

Series: Basic American Documents

The publication of this volume was supported by the Jagiellonian University – Institute of American Studies and Polish Diaspora and Faculty of International and Political Studies

REVIEWER

*prof. dr hab. Jadwiga Kiwerska*

COVER DESIGN

*Paweł Bigos*

© Copyright by Karol Derwich & Jagiellonian University Press

First edition, Kraków 2014

All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

ISBN 978-83-233-3746-1



[www.wuj.pl](http://www.wuj.pl)

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego

Redakcja: ul. Michałowskiego 9/2, 31-126 Kraków

tel. 12-663-23-81, tel./fax 12-663-23-83

Dystrybucja: tel. 12-631-01-97, tel./fax 12-631-01-98

tel. kom. 506-006-674, e-mail: [sprzedaz@wuj.pl](mailto:sprzedaz@wuj.pl)

Konto: PEKAO SA, nr 80 1240 4722 1111 0000 4856 3325

# Contents

<b>Foreword</b> .....	7
<b>Chapter One. The First Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century</b> .....	9
<i>Simón Bolívar: Letter from Jamaica</i> , September 6, 1815 .....	10
<i>The Monroe Doctrine</i> , December 2, 1823 .....	17
<i>President James Polk's First Annual Message</i> , December 2, 1845.....	20
<i>Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo</i> , February 2, 1848.....	23
<b>Chapter Two. The Cuban-American Affairs</b> .....	27
<i>John Quincy Adams' Letter to Hugh Nelson</i> , April 28, 1823 .....	28
<i>The Ostend Manifest</i> , October 15, 1854.....	32
<i>José Martí, Nuestra America (Our America)</i> , January 30, 1891 .....	35
<i>The Decision to Act Against Spain</i> , William McKinley, April 11, 1898 .....	41
<i>The Teller Amendment</i> , April 20, 1898.....	48
<i>The Platt Amendment</i> , March 2, 1902 .....	50
<i>Fidel Castro's Address before the U.N. General Assembly</i> , September 26, 1960 .....	51
<b>Chapter Three. Inter-oceanic Canal in Central America</b> .....	59
<i>The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty</i> , April 19, 1850 .....	60
<i>The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty</i> , November 18, 1901 .....	62
<i>The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty</i> , November 18, 1903.....	64
<i>Torrijos-Carter Treaties</i> , September 7, 1977.....	67
<b>Chapter Four. At the Turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century</b> .....	71
<i>James Blaine Opening Address at the First International American Conference</i> , October 2, 1889 .....	72
<i>The Olney Memorandum</i> , July 20, 1895.....	74
<i>The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine</i> .....	77
<i>The Fourth International American Conference</i> , July 20 – August 30, 1910 .....	81
<i>Woodrow Wilson Non-recognition Doctrine</i> .....	85
<i>A Latin American Doctrine of Anti-imperialism</i> , Victor Haya de la Torre, 1926.....	87
<b>Chapter Five. Good Neighbor Policy</b> .....	91
<i>The Clark Memorandum</i> , December 17, 1928 .....	92
<i>Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Good Neighbor Policy</i> .....	93
<i>The Anti-war Treaty of Non-aggression and Conciliation (Saavedra Lamas Treaty)</i> , October 10, 1933.....	95
<i>7<sup>th</sup> International Conference of American States</i> , Montevideo, December 26, 1933.....	98
<i>Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation</i> , December 21, 1936.....	102

<b>Chapter Six. Inter-American System</b> .....	105
<i>The Act of Chapultepec, March 6, 1945</i> .....	106
<i>The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, September 2, 1947</i> .....	110
<i>The Charter of the Organization of American States, April 30, 1948</i> .....	113
<i>American Treaty on Pacific Settlement (Pact of Bogota), April 30, 1948</i> .....	120
<i>Resolutions Adopted at the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Punta del Este, Uruguay, January 22–31, 1962</i> .....	126
<b>Chapter Seven. The Cold War in the Western Hemisphere</b> .....	133
<i>Caracas Declaration of Solidarity, March 28, 1954</i> .....	134
<i>The Alliance for Progress</i> .....	136
<i>The Second Declaration of Havana, February 4, 1962</i> .....	144
<i>Guerilla Warfare: A Method, 1963</i> .....	151
<i>The National Security of All the Americas Is at Stake in Central America</i> .....	157
<b>Chapter Eight. The End of the Cold War and Democratization</b> .....	161
<i>The Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, 1990</i> .....	162
<i>The Santiago Declaration and the Mechanism of Defending Democracy in America, 1991</i> .....	164
<i>Declaration of Managua, 1993</i> .....	168
<i>The North American Free Trade Agreement / Tratado de Libre Comercio en America del Norte, 1994</i> .....	171
<b>Chapter Nine. The Summits of the Americas</b> .....	177
<i>The First Summit of the Americas, Miami, December 9–11, 1994</i> .....	178
<i>The Second Summit of the Americas, Santiago de Chile, April 18–19, 1998</i> .....	181
<i>The Third Summit of the Americas, Quebec City, April 20–22, 2001</i> .....	185
<i>The Fourth Summit of the Americas, Mar del Plata, November 5, 2005</i> .....	189
<b>Chapter Ten. The War on Drugs</b> .....	195
<i>Richard Nixon's "War on Drugs"</i> .....	196
<i>Illegal Drugs as a Threat to National Security and the Certification Procedure</i> .....	200
<i>Plan Colombia, 2000</i> .....	205
<i>Merida Initiative</i> .....	212

# Foreword

This volume represents the latest one of the *Basic American Documents*. The series is the product of research carried out by the Institute of American Studies and Polish Diaspora and the Institute of Political Studies and International Relations of the Jagiellonian University. Over the past few years this series has presented impressive collections of primary sources related to American history, foreign policy and constitutional law.<sup>1</sup>

In this volume Karol Derwich, a Ph.D. from the Center for Latin American Studies of the Institute of American Studies and Polish Diaspora, presents a collection of primary sources related to U.S. relations with Latin American and Caribbean region. The volume, organized by chronology and theme, will be especially useful for those scholars focusing on U.S. foreign policy in Latin American and the Caribbean region.

The selection of texts and documents will seek to demonstrate a more modern and complicated history. There are, of course, several texts documenting the American domination over Latin American and Caribbean States. Of particular note are those outlining recent differences between the United States and its southern neighbors over the anti-drug policy and attitudes toward economic development. The works of Simón Bolívar and José Martí have provided eloquent testimony of how American governments have historically sought to dominate its southern neighbors. Mexico, Cuba and most of Central American and Caribbean States have especially painful memories of American imperialism.

But there are also significant documents that demonstrate how the United States and Latin American and Caribbean States have established significant forms of regional cooperation. In the past these agreements have helped to ease otherwise conflicting sets of interests, values and objectives. The Pan-American movement in the 1920s and 1930s is perhaps the best example of this cooperation that at the time was historically unique in international affairs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paweł Laidler, *Basic Cases in U.S. Constitutional Law: The Separation of Powers*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2005; Łukasz Wordliczek, *U.S. Foreign Policy: Procedure and Substance*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2005; Robert Kłosowicz, *Basic Cases in U.S. History: For the Colonies to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2006; Paweł Laidler, *Basic cases in U.S. constitutional law: rights and liberties*, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2009

It would be difficult for any one volume to present a truly comprehensive history of this historically troubled relationship. But this volume of primary documents will certainly add new insights and help shed new light on U.S. foreign policy in this very important region of the world.

*Prof. Andrzej Mania, Ph.D.*  
*Series Editor*



## Chapter One

# The First Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century

The US relations with Latin American and the Caribbean region during the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century were marked by two tendencies. The first one was the attempt at establishing initial cooperation between the United States and its younger neighbors in the south. Both sides were convinced about the common interests, among which the most important was the effort taken to strengthen their security and to minimize the danger of a European intervention. The second one was growing divisions between the developing United States on the one side and the Latin American countries that were mostly immersed in internal chaos, on the other. This is why in the first years of independence the mutual perception was positive, however the consciousness of differences were quite strong. This was already mentioned by Simon Bolivar in his *Letter from Jamaica*. He pointed out the important role of the United States in inspiring the idea of independence among the citizens of the Spanish colonies in America. Simultaneously, he wrote about the differences between the US and Latin American nations. This text reached the status of one of the most important in the period of states formations in Latin America. Due to those differences, Bolivar decided to not invite the “northern brothers” to the Panama Congress in 1826.

As the United States were still quite a weak country, their authorities were looking for any solutions that would help ensure national security. Because the military and economic potential was not sufficient, efforts were taken in the diplomatic area to eliminate any danger of European intervention in the Western Hemisphere. This was the goal of the Monroe Doctrine. The territorial expansion of the United States also had its impact on US relations with Latin America. Naturally, it directly only impacted Mexico as a direct neighbor, however conflicts with Mexico significantly damaged the image of the US in the eyes of other Latin American countries and its citizens. The Manifest Destiny and its later modifications constituted the perception of the United States as a hegemonic rival that tends to dominate in the Western Hemisphere among many Latin Americans. The war with Mexico in 1846–1848 only deepened the growing division between the United States and the Latin American countries.

The first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was not a time of intensive mutual relations. However, already in the first decades of that century some tendencies that were present

for the next decades in US – Latin American relations could be observed. Some of them are still present today. The consciousness of mutual differences has survived until the present time among Latin Americans and often had and still has a huge influence on their attitudes toward the United States. Also, the tendency to treat the Western Hemisphere as its own sphere of influence has been present in the US Latin American policy in various periods. The limited nature of those relations was a consequence of the condition of both the United States and the new Latin American States. The main attention was focused on internal affairs and the most important objective of foreign policy was strengthening the just achieved independence.

## Simón Bolívar: Letter from Jamaica, September 6, 1815

The wars for independence in Latin America began at the turn of the first and second decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. There are plenty of reasons that caused the great wave of insurrections. They can be divided in two groups: internal and external. One of the first nations of Latin America that rose up was Venezuela. In April of 1810, the town council (*cabildo abierto*) in Caracas, dominated by radical Creoles, announced its decision of definitive severance of any dependency from Spain. One of the most important persons among this radical Creole group was Simón Bolívar. Soon he became an unquestionable leader of wars for independence, not only in Venezuela but in a majority of the Latin American countries. A few months later, in July of 1811, the Venezuelan Congress announced an Act of Independence and the insurgent forces, led by Simón Bolívar entered Caracas. It was the first great success of this young leader. Because the majority of the country was still dominated by loyalists, he started his campaign to assure real independence for the entire territory of Venezuela that was a part of the viceroyalty of New Grenada. After two years of struggles, not only with loyalists but also with other forces that did not accept his leadership, he once again entered Caracas as a victorious hero. He was granted the title of *Libertador* as a consequence of his military successes in the struggle for independence. The situation in Venezuela in the middle of the second decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was very complicated. The first great successes of the forces led by Simón Bolívar did not mean the final victory and independence. First, the *Libertador* has serious enemies in his own country. The most important and powerful force were the so called *llaneros* – cowboys, farmers and fugitive slaves that lived in unfriendly region called *llanos*. At that time they were commanded by their leader, José Tomás Boves. Together with loyalist forces they defeated Bolívar's army in mid-1814. This resulted in Bolívar's temporary departure from Venezuela. He decided to go to Bogota where he wanted to help in the struggle against the Spaniards and their supporters. Simultaneously, there were great changes in European affairs. After the end of Napoleonic wars on

the European continent, there were strong efforts to restore the old order. One of the elements of this restoration was to return the old dynasties overthrown by Napoleon to power. For Spain this meant the return of the Bourbons and Ferdinand VII. Additionally, the end of the wars in Europe permitted Spain to send more soldiers to the New World to fight with insurrectionists. This took place at the beginning of 1815. Pablo Morillo was the commander of those new Spanish forces in New Grenada. The new Spanish army achieved important victories. It is no coincidence that Murillo's successful campaign was named *reconquist*. It was the most difficult moment of the war for independence in Venezuela and in other regions of the viceroyalty of New Granada. Murillo's forces entered Cartagena and Bogota in Colombia and Caracas in Venezuela. Simón Bolívar had to escape one more time. This time he went to the Caribbean island of Jamaica. His stay in Jamaica brought an important development of his ideas and explanations of his perception of Latin America and the Caribbean region.

His ideas and visions were exemplified in his letter to Henry Cullen that he wrote in September 6, 1815 in Kingston, Jamaica. He describes the situation of the Latin American countries that were struggling for their independence. He underlines that the fight which began in 1810 is an irreversible process that can have only one result: victory and sovereignty from Spanish domination. Bolívar's explication of the differences between Latin American nations and Europeans is very interesting in his letter. In its explication, he pointed out the pre-Colombian civilizations that had lived in America long before Christopher Columbus' journey. However, he does not deny Spain's huge contribution to the process of creating a completely new race that is dominant in Latin America. This new race has its roots in the ancient civilizations of the Americas but also has its European component thanks to the Spanish conquest. "We are neither Indians nor Europeans, we are a special mix between the legitimate owners of this land and the usurper Spaniards," wrote Simón Bolívar in his letter. Bolívar's Letter from Jamaica also includes an explication of the injustice that the colonies in Latin America had to endure from the Spanish monarchy. Finally, Bolívar spun visions about the future of Latin America after successful war for independence. His recipe for the sovereign existence of Latin American countries was close unity. The Latin American countries should be based on completely different foundations than Europe. That is why he proposed a republican form of government. He perceived monarchy as one of the reasons for the numerous wars and armed conflicts between European countries. But to secure its independence and liberty, new Latin American republics would have to cooperate closely. Therefore he suggested the creation of a strong union that would unite all the former Spanish colonies. He desired the creation of strong Latin American nation that would be derived principally from its liberty and glory.

The question of who the letter was dedicated to often appears. This is a deep insight into the situation of Latin America in the middle of the second decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It was written in Spanish, in a rather sophisticated style. It needs to be remembered that a majority of the population was not educated. Most of the Indians did not speak Spanish. Soldiers in the insurgent armies were usually uneducated, common people. It seems that Bolívar objective was to reach two kinds of subjects. The first were the Creole elites of Spanish colonies. They were the root of the independence movements; however, there were also a lot of conservative and loyalist attitudes among this group. The Creoles, in

majority, were very well educated and were able to understand the real sense of Bolivar's message. Also, Europeans were those to whom he dedicated his writing. It was a type of explanation of the struggle for independence.

Contestación de un americano meridional a un caballero de esta isla, Kingston, 6 de septiembre de 1815

Source: <http://www.ensayistas.org/antologia/XIXA/bolivar/> (16.09.2013)

"Tres siglos ha, dice V., que empezaron las barbaridades que los españoles cometieron en el grande hemisferio de Colón." Barbaridades que la presente edad ha rechazado como fabulosas, porque parecen superiores a la perversidad humana; y jamás serían creídas por los críticos modernos, si, constantes y repetidos documentos, no testificasen estas infaustas verdades. El filantrópico obispo de Chiapas, el apóstol de la América, Las Casas, ha dejado a la posteridad una breve relación de ellas, extractadas de las sumarias que siguieron en Sevilla a los conquistadores, con el testimonio de cuantas personas respetables había entonces en el Nuevo Mundo, y con los procesos mismos que los tiranos se hicieron entre sí, como consta por los más sublimes historiadores de aquel tiempo. Todos los imparciales han hecho justicia al celo, verdad y virtudes de aquel amigo de la humanidad, que con tanto fervor y firmeza, denunció ante su gobierno y contemporáneos los actos más horribles de un frenesí sanguinario.

¡Con cuánta emoción de gratitud leo el pasaje de la carta de Vd. en que me dice: "que espera que los sucesos que siguieron entonces a las armas españolas, acompañen ahora a las de sus contrarios, los muy oprimidos americanos meridionales"! Yo tomo esta esperanza por una predicción, si la justicia decide las contiendas de los hombres. El suceso coronará nuestros esfuerzos porque el destino de la América se ha fijado irrevocablemente; el lazo que la unía a la España está cortado; la opinión era toda su fuerza; por ella se estrechaban mutuamente las partes de aquella inmensa monarquía; lo que antes las enlazaba, ya las divide; más grande es el odio que nos ha inspirado la Península, que el mar que nos separa de ella; menos difícil es unir los dos continentes, que reconciliar los espíritus de ambos países. El hábito a la obediencia; un comercio de intereses, de luces, de religión; una recíproca benevolencia; una tierna solicitud por la cuna y la gloria de nuestros padres; en fin, todo lo que formaba nuestra esperanza, nos venía de España. De aquí nacía un principio de adhesión que parecía eterno, no obstante que la conducta de nuestros dominadores relajaba esta simpatía, o, por mejor decir, este apego forzado por el imperio de la dominación. Al presente sucede lo contrario: la muerte, el deshonor, cuanto es nocivo, nos amenaza y tememos; todo lo sufrimos de esa desnaturalizada madrastra. El velo se ha rasgado, ya hemos visto la luz, y se nos quiere volver a las tinieblas; se han roto las cadenas; ya hemos sido libres, y nuestros enemigos pretenden de nuevo esclavizarnos. Por lo tanto, la América combate con despecho; y rara vez la desesperación no ha arrastrado tras sí la victoria.

Porque los sucesos hayan sido parciales y alternados, no debemos desconfiar de la fortuna. En unas partes triunfan los independientes mientras que los tiranos en lugares diferentes obtienen sus ventajas, y ¿cuál es el resultado final? ¿no está el Nuevo Mundo entero, conmovido y armado para su defensa? Echemos una ojeada y observaremos una lucha simultánea en la inmensa extensión de este hemisferio.

El belicoso estado de las provincias del Río de la Plata ha purgado su territorio y conducido sus armas vencedoras al Alto Perú, conmoviendo a Arequipa e inquietando a los realistas de Lima. Cerca de un millón de habitantes disfruta allí de su libertad.

El reino de Chile, poblado de 800.000 almas, está lidiando contra sus enemigos que pretenden dominarlo; pero en vano, porque los que antes pusieron un término a sus conquistas, los indómitos y libres araucanos, son sus vecinos y compatriotas; y su ejemplo sublime es suficiente para probarles, que el pueblo que ama su independencia por fin la logra.

El virreinato del Perú, cuya población asciende a millón y medio de habitantes, es sin duda el más sumiso y al que más sacrificios se le han arrancado para la causa del Rey; y bien que sean vanas las relaciones concernientes a aquella porción de América, es indudable que ni está tranquila, ni es capaz de oponerse al torrente que amenaza a las más de sus provincias.

La Nueva Granada que es, por decirlo así, el corazón de la América, obedece a un gobierno general, exceptuando el reino de Quito, que con la mayor dificultad contienen sus enemigos por ser fuertemente adicto a la causa de su patria, y las provincias de Panamá y Santa Marta que sufren, no sin dolor, la tiranía de sus señores. Dos millones y medio de habitantes están esparcidos en aquel territorio, que actualmente defienden contra el ejército español bajo el general Morillo, que es verosímil sucumba delante de la inexpugnable plaza de Cartagena. Mas si la tomare será a costa de grandes pérdidas, y desde luego carecerá de fuerzas bastantes para subyugar a los morigerados y bravos moradores del interior.

En cuanto a la heroica y desdichada Venezuela, sus acontecimientos han sido tan rápidos, y sus devastaciones tales, que casi la han reducido a una absoluta indigencia y a una soledad espantosa; no obstante que era uno de los más bellos países de cuantos hacían el orgullo de la América. Sus tiranos gobiernan un desierto; y sólo oprimen a tristes restos que, escapados de la muerte, alimentan una precaria existencia: algunas mujeres, niños y ancianos son los que quedan. Los más de los hombres han perecido por no ser esclavos, y los que viven, combaten con furor en los campos y en los pueblos internos, hasta expirar o arrojar al mar a los que, insaciables de sangre y de crímenes, rivalizan con los primeros monstruos que hicieron desaparecer de la América a su raza primitiva. Cerca de un millón de habitantes se contaba en Venezuela; y, sin exageración, se puede asegurar que una cuarta parte ha sido sacrificada por la tierra, la espada, el hambre, la peste, las peregrinaciones; excepto el terremoto, todo resultado de la guerra.

(...)

Este cuadro representa una escala militar de 2.000 leguas de longitud y 900 de latitud en su mayor extensión, en que 16.000.000 de americanos defienden sus derechos o están oprimidos por la nación española, que aunque fue, en algún tiempo, el más vasto imperio del mundo, sus restos son ahora impotentes para dominar el nuevo hemisferio y hasta para mantenerse en el antiguo. ¿Y la Europa civilizada, comerciante y amante de la libertad, permite que una vieja serpiente, por sólo satisfacer su saña envenenada, devore la más bella parte de nuestro globo? ¡Qué! ¿está la Europa sorda al clamor de su propio interés? ¿No tiene ya ojos para ver la justicia? ¿Tanto se ha endurecido, para ser de este modo insensible? Estas cuestiones cuanto más las medito, más me confunden: llego a pensar que se aspira a que desaparezca la América; pero es imposible, porque toda la Europa no es España. ¡Qué demencia la de nuestra enemiga, pretender reconquistar la América, sin marina, sin tesoro y casi sin soldados! pues los que tiene, apenas son bastantes para retener a su propio pueblo en una violenta obediencia y defenderse de sus vecinos. Por otra parte, ¿podrá esta nación hacer el comercio exclusivo de la mitad del mundo, sin manufacturas, sin producciones territoriales, sin artes, sin ciencias, sin política? Lograda que fuese esta loca empresa; y suponiendo más aun, lograda la pacificación, los hijos de los actuales americanos, unidos con los de los europeos recon-

quistadores, ¿no volverían a formar dentro de veinte años, los mismos patrióticos desig-  
nios que ahora se están combatiendo?

La Europa haría un bien a la España en disuadirla de su obstinada temeridad; porque a lo  
menos le ahorraría los gastos que expende, y la sangre que derrama; a fin de que, fija-  
ndo su atención en sus propios recintos, fundase su prosperidad y poder sobre bases  
más sólidas que las de inciertas conquistas, un comercio precario y exacciones violentas  
en pueblos remotos, enemigos y poderosos. La Europa misma por miras de sana política,  
debería haber preparado y ejecutado el proyecto de la independencia americana; no sólo  
porque el equilibrio del mundo así lo exige; sino porque este es el medio legítimo y seg-  
uro de adquirirse establecimientos ultramarinos de comercio. La Europa que no se halla  
agitada por las violentas pasiones de la venganza, ambición y codicia, como la España,  
parece que estaba autorizada por todas las leyes de la equidad a ilustrarla sobre sus bien  
entendidos intereses.

(...)

Todavía es más difícil presentir la suerte futura del Nuevo Mundo, establecer principios  
sobre su política, y casi profetizar la naturaleza del gobierno que llegará a adoptar. Toda  
idea relativa al porvenir de este país me parece aventurada. ¿Se pudo prever cuando el  
género humano se hallaba en su infancia, rodeado de tanta incertidumbre, ignorancia  
y error, cuál sería el régimen que abrazaría para su conservación? ¿Quién se habría atre-  
vido a decir, tal nación será república o monarquía, ésta será pequeña, aquella grande?  
En mi concepto, ésta es la imagen de nuestra situación. Nosotros somos un pequeño  
género humano; poseemos un mundo aparte; cercado por dilatados mares, nuevo en  
casi todas las artes y ciencias aunque en cierto modo viejo en los usos de la sociedad  
civil. Yo considero el estado actual de la América, como cuando desplomado el Imperio  
Romano cada desmembración formó un sistema político, conforme a sus intereses y sit-  
uación o siguiendo la ambición particular de algunos jefes, familias o corporaciones; con  
esta notable diferencia, que aquellos miembros dispersos volvían a restablecer sus an-  
tiguas naciones con las alteraciones que exigían las cosas o los sucesos; mas nosotros,  
que apenas conservamos vestigios de lo que en otros tiempo fue, y que por otra parte  
no somos indios ni europeos, sino una especie media entre los legítimos propietarios del  
país y los usurpadores españoles: en suma, siendo nosotros americanos por nacimiento  
y nuestros derechos los de Europa, tenemos que disputar éstos a los del país y que man-  
tenernos en él contra la invasión de los invasores; así nos hallamos en el caso más ex-  
traordinario y complicado; no obstante que es una especie de adivinación indicar cuál  
será el resultado de la línea de política que la América siga, me atrevo a aventurar algu-  
nas conjeturas, que, desde luego, caracterizo de arbitrarias, dictadas por un deseo  
racional, y no por un raciocinio probable.

(...)

El emperador Carlos V formó un pacto con los descubridores, conquistadores y po-  
bladores de América, que, como dice Guerra, es nuestro contrato social. Los reyes de  
España convinieron solemnemente con ellos que lo ejecutasen por su cuenta y riesgo,  
prohibiéndoseles hacerlo a costa de la real hacienda, y por esta razón se les concedía que  
fuesen señores de la tierra, que organizarasen la administración y ejerciesen la judicatura  
en apelación, con otras muchas exenciones y privilegios que sería prolijo detallar. El Rey  
se comprometió a no enajenar jamás las provincias americanas, como que a él no tocaba  
otra jurisdicción que la del alto dominio, siendo una especie de propiedad feudal la que  
allí tenían los conquistadores para sí y sus descendientes. Al mismo tiempo existen leyes  
expresas que favorecen casi exclusivamente a los naturales del país originarios de  
España en cuanto a los empleos civiles, eclesiásticos y de rentas. Por manera que, con  
una violación manifiesta de las leyes y de los pactos subsistentes, se han visto despojar  
aquellos naturales de la autoridad constitucional que les daba su código.

(...)

Todos los nuevos gobiernos marcaron sus primeros pasos con el establecimiento de juntas populares. Estas formaron en seguida reglamentos para la convocación de congresos que produjeron alteraciones importantes. Venezuela erigió un gobierno democrático y federal, declarando previamente los derechos del hombre, manteniendo el equilibrio de los poderes, y estatuyendo leyes generales en favor de la libertad civil, la imprenta y otras; finalmente se constituyó un gobierno independiente. La Nueva Granada siguió con uniformidad los establecimientos políticos y cuantas reformas hizo Venezuela, poniendo por base fundamental de su constitución el sistema federal más exagerado que jamás existió; recientemente se ha mejorado con respecto al poder ejecutivo general, que ha obtenido cuantas atribuciones le corresponden. Según entiendo, Buenos Aires y Chile han seguido esta misma línea de operaciones; pero como nos hallamos a tanta distancia, los documentos son tan raros y las noticias tan inexactas, no me animaré ni aun a bosquejar el cuadro de sus transacciones.

(...)

Los acontecimientos de la Tierra Firme nos han probado que las instituciones perfectamente representativas, no son adecuadas a nuestro carácter, costumbres y luces actuales. En Caracas el espíritu de partido tomó su origen en las sociedades, asambleas, y elecciones populares; y estos partidos nos tornaron a la esclavitud. Y así como Venezuela ha sido la república americana que más se ha adelantado en sus instituciones políticas, también ha sido el más claro ejemplo de la ineficacia de la forma democrática y federal para nuestros nacientes estados. En Nueva Granada las excesivas facultades de los gobiernos provinciales y la falta de centralización en el general, han conducido aquel precioso país al estado a que se ve reducido en el día. Por esta razón, sus débiles enemigos se han conservado, contra todas las probabilidades. En cuanto que nuestros compatriotas no adquieran los talentos y las virtudes políticas que distinguen a nuestros hermanos del Norte, los sistemas enteramente populares, lejos de sernos favorables, temo mucho que vengan a ser nuestra ruina. Desgraciadamente estas cualidades parecen estar muy distantes de nosotros en el grado que se requiere; y por el contrario, estamos dominados de los vicios que se contraen bajo la dirección de una nación como la española, que sólo ha sobresalido en fiereza, ambición, venganza y codicia.

"Es más difícil, dice Montesquieu, sacar un pueblo de la servidumbre, que subyugar uno libre." Esta verdad está comprobada por los anales de todos los tiempos, que nos muestran, las más de las naciones libres, sometidas al yugo, y muy pocas de las esclavas recobrar su libertad. A pesar de este convencimiento, los meridionales de este continente han manifestado el conato de conseguir instituciones liberales y aun perfectas, sin duda, por efecto del instinto que tienen todos los hombres de aspirar a su mejor felicidad posible; la que se alcanza, infaliblemente, en las sociedades civiles, cuando ellas están fundadas sobre las bases de la justicia, de la libertad y de la igualdad. Pero ¿seremos nosotros capaces de mantener en su verdadero equilibrio la difícil carga de una república? ¿Se puede concebir que un pueblo recientemente desencadenado se lance a la esfera de la libertad, sin que, como a Icaro, se le deshagan las alas y recaiga en el abismo? Tal prodigio es inconcebible, nunca visto. Por consiguiente, no hay un raciocinio verosímil que nos halague con esta esperanza.

Yo deseo más que otro alguno ver formar en América la más grande nación del mundo, menos por su extensión y riquezas que por su libertad y gloria. Aunque aspiro a la perfección del gobierno de mi patria, no puedo persuadirme que el Nuevo Mundo sea por el momento regido por una gran república; como es imposible, no me atrevo a desearlo, y menos deseo una monarquía universal de América, porque este proyecto, sin ser útil, es también imposible. Los abusos que actualmente existen no se reformarían y nuestra regeneración sería infructuosa. Los estados Americanos han menester de los cuidados de gobiernos paternos que curen las llagas y las heridas del despotismo y la guerra. La metrópoli, por ejemplo, sería Méjico, que es la única que puede serlo por su poder intrínseco, sin el cual no hay metrópoli. Supongamos que fuese el istmo de Panamá, punto

céntrico para todos los extremos de este vasto continente, ¿no continuarían éstos en la languidez y aun en el desorden actual? Para que un solo gobierno dé vida, anime, ponga en acción todos los resortes de la prosperidad pública, corrija, ilustre y perfeccione al Nuevo Mundo, sería necesario que tuviese las facultades de un Dios, y cuando menos las luces y virtudes de todos los hombres.

(...)

Es una idea grandiosa pretender formar de todo el Mundo Nuevo una sola nación con un solo vínculo que ligue sus partes entre sí y con el todo. Ya que tiene su origen, una lengua, unas costumbres y una religión, debería, por consiguiente, tener un solo gobierno que confederase los diferentes estados que hayan de formarse; mas no es posible, porque climas remotos, situaciones diversas, intereses opuestos, caracteres desemejantes, dividen a la América. ¡Qué bello sería que el Istmo de Panamá fuese para nosotros lo que el de Corinto para los griegos! Ojalá que algún día tengamos la fortuna de instalar allí un augusto congreso de los representantes de las repúblicas, reinos e imperios a tratar y discutir sobre los altos intereses de la paz y de la guerra, con las naciones de las otras tres partes del mundo. Esta especie de corporación podrá tener lugar en alguna época dichosa de nuestra regeneración; otra esperanza es infundada, semejante a la del abate St. Pierre, que concibió el laudable delirio de reunir un congreso europeo para decidir de la suerte y de los intereses de aquellas naciones.

(...)

Seguramente la unión es la que nos falta para completar la obra de nuestra regeneración. Sin embargo, nuestra división no es extraña, porque tal es el distintivo de las guerras civiles formadas generalmente entre dos partidos: conservadores y reformadores. Los primeros son, por lo común, más numerosos, porque el imperio de la costumbre produce el efecto de la obediencia a las potestades establecidas; los últimos son siempre menos numerosos aunque más vehementes e ilustrados. De este modo la masa física se equilibra con la fuerza moral, y la contienda se prolonga siendo sus resultados muy inciertos. Por fortuna, entre nosotros, la masa ha seguido a la inteligencia.

Yo diré a Vd. lo que puede ponernos en actitud de expulsar a los españoles y de fundar un gobierno libre: es la unión, ciertamente; mas esta unión no nos vendrá por prodigios divinos sino por efectos sensibles y esfuerzos bien dirigidos. La América está encontrada entre sí, porque se halla abandonada de todas las naciones; aislada en medio del universo, sin relaciones diplomáticas ni auxilios militares, y combatida por la España que posee más elementos para la guerra que cuantos nosotros furtivamente podemos adquirir.

Cuando los sucesos no están asegurados, cuando el estado es débil, y cuando las empresas son remotas, todos los hombres vacilan, las opiniones se dividen, las pasiones las agitan y los enemigos las animan para triunfar por este fácil medio. Luego que seamos fuertes, bajo los auspicios de una nación liberal que nos preste su protección, se nos verá de acuerdo cultivar las virtudes y los talentos que conducen a la gloria; entonces seguiremos la marcha majestuosa hacia las grandes prosperidades a que está destinada la América meridional; entonces las ciencias y las artes que nacieron en el Oriente y han ilustrado la Europa volarán a Colombia libre, que las convidará con un asilo.



## The Monroe Doctrine, December 2, 1823

In the sphere of foreign relations the period of James Monroe's presidency was dominated by two subjects: the political situation in Europe after the end of Napoleonic wars and the eruption of wars for independence in the Spanish colonies in the New World. At the beginning of the 1820s, these two problems were closely related to each other.

The end of the Napoleonic wars in 1815 was the moment in which the victorious powers started looking for a mechanism that would ensure the restoration of the old order (ancient regime) which was interrupted by the Napoleon's campaign. The most interested in that project were the monarchs of three most reactionist monarchies: Russia, Prussia and Austria. The Vienna Congress was the first important step toward the restoration of the old order. One of the most important goals of that kind of policy was to stop any liberal movements that could threaten the absolutist monarchies. To strengthen that policy, Tsar Alexander of Russia proposed a closer alliance with its counterparts in Prussia and Austria. The monarchs declared that the principal aim of the alliance is to "Manifest before the whole universe their unshakable determination to take as their sole guide (...) the precepts of religion, namely, the rules of Justice, Christian Charity and Peace. (...) Conformably with the words of the Holy Scripture, which command all men to consider each other as brethren, the three contracting Monarchs will remain united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity. Considering each other as fellow countrymen, they will on all occasions and in all places lend each other aid and assistance (...)." The Holy Alliance, as it used to be called, was open to any other state whose authorities shared its objectives. From the very beginning, Great Britain was outside the alliance. Why did those affairs matter so much to the Monroe administration in the United States? The fundamental rules of the Holy Alliance were in contradiction with the basic American values. The Holy Alliance desired to fight with all liberal and republican ideas.

US diplomacy perceived the Holy Alliance as a potential threat to American security because of the situation in Latin America. From the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Spanish colonies in that region were fighting for independence. After the restoration of the ancient regime in the consequence of the Vienna Congress and the creation of the Holy Alliance, there was a possibility that the European powers could help Spain in their struggle for preserving its colonial empire in America. This could pose a real danger to the United States. In this situation, it was natural that the two states that were outside the Holy Alliance and had completely different interests in international relations, were searching for the most legitimate policy against a potential danger from the Holy Alliance. The initiative came from British foreign minister George Canning. At the beginning of 1823, he contacted the American envoy in London to discuss the possibilities of closer cooperation in their policy toward the Holy Alliance and its possible actions in the case of the Spanish colonies in Latin America. One of the most important elements of the British proposition was the announcement that the American continent should be free from any attempts of European powers in establishing new colonies. This proposition was widely considered in the United States. At the beginning, President

Monroe's attitude was positive. However, he decided to consult the answer with his aides. Among them were former presidents Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. Both recommended a positive reply to the British initiative. One of the very few persons opposed to that was Monroe's Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams. As he strongly supported the idea of no colonization of the American continent, he was very careful about the joint announcement with Great Britain. He was deeply convinced that this idea should be clearly expressed but his main concern was that this kind of joint declaration could have negative effects in the future. In short, he was aware of the benefits of the current situation but – as one of the greatest Secretaries of State in US history – he was also thinking about the future. And he was afraid that the joint declaration could bound US policy in the Latin American region with British interests. In this case, he proposed that President Monroe announce this principle unilaterally. The unilateral declaration was also justified as British diplomacy lost interest in the joint announcement.

As the date of the President's annual message to the Congress came along, John Quincy Adams wrote some fundamental principles of American foreign policy. They were softly amended by the President and included in the text of his seventh annual message, December 2, 1823. Apart from the already mentioned no colonization rule, it included the explication of differences between Europe and the New World. One of the most important ones was the very nature of the political system. According to President Monroe, the European political system was one of the principle causes of wars on the European continent. For this reason, the United States would perceive every effort to expand European political system – meaning a monarchy – as a danger to its national security. Also, President Monroe maintained the fundamental rule of American foreign policy which was the non-intervention in European political affairs and conflicts.

The so-called Monroe Doctrine is often described as the basis of American isolationism. In fact the United States did not isolate itself from any part of the world. It played an active role in the Latin American region; it has its interest in Asia and northern Africa. The European countries were the most important economic partners. If there was isolationism in the American policy, it was the desire to isolate from the political disputes in Europe. This statement is nothing new in American foreign policy, as it can be found in the Declaration of Independence (1776) and George Washington's Farewell Address (1796).

### James Monroe Seventh Annual Message, December 2, 1823

Source: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29465> (16.09.2013)

A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789–1897, Published by the Authority of Congress, 1898; pp. 207–220

The citizens of the United States cherish sentiments the most friendly in favor of the liberty and happiness of their fellow men on that side of the Atlantic. In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy so to do.

It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers.

The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. This difference proceeds from that which exists in their respective Governments; and to the defense of our own, which has been achieved by the loss of so much blood and treasure, and matured by the wisdom of their most enlightened citizens, and under which we have enjoyed unexampled felicity, this whole nation is devoted.

We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere, but with the Governments who have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and on just principles, acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

In the war between those new Governments and Spain we declared our neutrality at the time of their recognition, and to this we have adhered, and shall continue to adhere, provided no change shall occur which, in the judgment of the competent authorities of this Government, shall make a corresponding change on the part of the United States indispensable to their security.

The late events in Spain and Portugal shew that Europe is still unsettled. Of this important fact no stronger proof can be adduced than that the allied powers should have thought it proper, on any principle satisfactory to themselves, to have interposed by force in the internal concerns of Spain. To what extent such interposition may be carried, on the same principle, is a question in which all independent powers whose governments differ from theirs are interested, even those most remote, and surely none more so than the United States.

Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is, not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; to consider the government de facto as the legitimate government for us; to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy, meeting in all instances the just claims of every power, submitting to injuries from none.

But in regard to those continents circumstances are eminently and conspicuously different. It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren, if left to themselves, would adopt it of their own accord. It is equally impossible, therefore, that we should behold such interposition in any form with indifference. If we look to the comparative strength and resources of Spain and those new Governments, and their distance from each other, it must be obvious that she can never subdue them. It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves, in the hope that other powers will pursue the same course.

## President James Polk's First Annual Message, December 2, 1845

From the end of the 1830s, the United States entered into an intensive process of territorial expansion. To expand its territory, the government of the Union used different instruments. Sometimes it could buy huge lands, as was in the case of the Louisiana purchase from France in 1803, sometimes it was diplomacy that served to purchase new territories, as for example in the case of Florida that was confirmed in the Adams-Onís Treaty in 1819. The efforts to broaden the territory of the Union culminated during the presidency of James K. Polk. He began his term in 1845. Already during the presidential campaign he underlined his strong support for any activities that could bring new territories to the United States. He was very pleased from the final accession of Texas but he was wildly announcing that his aim is to reach the Pacific coast and make it an American territory. His extremely expansionist policy was very carefully observed not only in Mexico that was directly affected by US territorial expansion, but also by European powers. Great Britain was directly interested in Polk's expansionist policy as one of his postulates was the annexation of the entire territory of Oregon. It should be remembered that this territory was jointly commanded by the United States and Great Britain since 1818.

In his first annual address, December 2, 1845, president James Polk devoted a lot of time to explaining the current state of the United States international situation. Naturally, the case of Texas' accession to the Union was discussed in first order. The consequence of this decision was the grave worsening of American relations with Mexico. The Mexican government perceived the accession as a danger to the national security of the Mexican state and did not accept it. US-Mexican relations deteriorated rapidly. In his speech, President Polk in details described the state of US relations with its southern neighbor. The second important subject of US foreign policy at the beginning of Polk's term was the case of the Oregon Territory and the dispute with Great Britain over its adhesion. The current state of negotiations with Great Britain was described in the address as well. In analyzing international situation of the United States, President Polk expressed his most important reflection related to the foreign policy of the United States. It should be no surprise that he invoked the Monroe Doctrine for this purpose. He did not negate the most important assumptions of the Monroe Doctrine but he interpreted it in a new, far more expansionist manner. As President Monroe spoke about the impossibility of the appearance of new European colonies in the Americas, President Polk said that national security of the United States requires that all European possessions in the North American continent should be removed and it should be dominated by the United States. This was a small but quite important change in the foundations of American foreign policy. With time it was started being referred to as Polk's interpretation of the Monroe doctrine. In his visions of the international relations in North America and the Western Hemisphere, Polk based the idea that the generally perceived US expansion as an obligation given to Americans from God to broaden civilization and democratic institutions in the entire continent of North America, on the Monroe Doctrine. Undoubtedly, during his entire presidency James Polk was taking great efforts to broaden American territory as far as it was possible.

## James K. Polk's First Annual Message, December 2, 1845

Source: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=29486> (16.09.2013)

In calling the attention of Congress to our relations with foreign powers, I am gratified to be able to state that though with some of them there have existed since your last session serious causes of irritation and misunderstanding, yet no actual hostilities have taken place. Adopting the maxim in the conduct of our foreign affairs "to ask nothing that is not right and submit to nothing that is wrong," it has been my anxious desire to preserve peace with all nations, but at the same time to be prepared to resist aggression and maintain all our just rights.

(...)

This accession to our territory has been a bloodless achievement. No arm of force has been raised to produce the result. The sword has had no part in the victory. We have not sought to extend our territorial possessions by conquest, or our republican institutions over a reluctant people. It was the deliberate homage of each people to the great principle of our federative union. If we consider the extent of territory involved in the annexation, its prospective influence on America, the means by which it has been accomplished, springing purely from the choice of the people themselves to share the blessings of our union, the history of the world may be challenged to furnish a parallel. The jurisdiction of the United States, which at the formation of the Federal Constitution was bounded by the St. Marys on the Atlantic, has passed the capes of Florida and been peacefully extended to the Del Norte. In contemplating the grandeur of this event it is not to be forgotten that the result was achieved in despite of the diplomatic interference of European monarchies. Even France, the country which had been our ancient ally, the country which has a common interest with us in maintaining the freedom of the seas, the country which, by the cession of Louisiana, first opened to us access to the Gulf of Mexico, the country with which we have been every year drawing more and more closely the bonds of successful commerce, most unexpectedly, and to our unfeigned regret, took part in an effort to prevent annexation and to impose on Texas, as a condition of the recognition of her independence by Mexico, that she would never join herself to the United States. We may rejoice that the tranquil and pervading influence of the American principle of self-government was sufficient to defeat the purposes of British and French interference, and that the almost unanimous voice of the people of Texas has given to that interference a peaceful and effective rebuke. From this example European Governments may learn how vain diplomatic arts and intrigues must ever prove upon this continent against that system of self-government which seems natural to our soil, and which will ever resist foreign interference.

(...)

I regret to inform you that our relations with Mexico since your last session have not been of the amicable character which it is our desire to cultivate with all foreign nations. On the 6th day of March last the Mexican envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the United States made a formal protest in the name of his Government against the joint resolution passed by Congress "for the annexation of Texas to the United States," which he chose to regard as a violation of the rights of Mexico, and in consequence of it he demanded his passports.

(...)

Since that time Mexico has until recently occupied an attitude of hostility toward the United States – has been marshaling and organizing armies, issuing proclamations, and

avowing the intention to make war on the United States, either by an open declaration or by invading Texas. Both the Congress and convention of the people of Texas invited this Government to send an army into that territory to protect and defend them against the menaced attack. The moment the terms of annexation offered by the United States were accepted by Texas the latter became so far a part of our own country as to make it our duty to afford such protection and defense. I therefore deemed it proper, as a precautionary measure, to order a strong squadron to the coasts of Mexico and to concentrate an efficient military force on the western frontier of Texas.

(...)

My attention was early directed to the negotiation which on the 4th of March last I found pending at Washington between the United States and Great Britain on the subject of the Oregon Territory. Three several attempts had been previously made to settle the questions in dispute between the two countries by negotiation upon the principle of compromise, but each had proved unsuccessful. These negotiations took place at London in the years 1818, 1824, and 1826 – the two first under the Administration of Mr. Monroe and the last under that of Mr. Adams. The negotiation of 1818, having failed to accomplish its object, resulted in the convention of the 20<sup>th</sup> of October of that year.

By the third article of that convention it was agreed that any country that may be claimed by either party on the northwest coast of America westward of the Stony Mountains shall, together with its harbors, bays, and creeks, and the navigation of all rivers within the same, be free and open for the term of ten years from the date of the signature of the present convention to the vessels, citizens, and subjects of the two powers; it being well understood that this agreement is not to be construed to the prejudice of any claim which either of the two high contracting parties may have to any part of the said country, nor shall it be taken to affect the claims of any other power or state to any part of the said country, the only object of the high contracting parties in that respect being to prevent disputes and differences amongst themselves.

(...)

It will become proper for Congress to determine what legislation they can in the meantime adopt without violating this convention. Beyond all question the protection of our laws and our jurisdiction, civil and criminal, ought to be immediately extended over our citizens in Oregon. They have had just cause to complain of our long neglect in this particular, and have in consequence been compelled for their own security and protection to establish a provisional government for themselves. Strong in their allegiance and ardent in their attachment to the United States, they have been thus cast upon their own resources. They are anxious that our laws should be extended over them, and I recommend that this be done by Congress with as little delay as possible in the full extent to which the British Parliament have proceeded in regard to British subjects in that Territory by their act of July 2, 1821, "for regulating the fur trade and establishing a criminal and civil jurisdiction within certain parts of North America." By this act Great Britain extended her laws and jurisdiction, civil and criminal, over her subjects engaged in the fur trade in that Territory. By it the courts of the Province of Upper Canada were empowered to take cognizance of causes civil and criminal. Justices of the peace and other judicial officers were authorized to be appointed in Oregon with power to execute all process issuing from the courts of that Province, and to "sit and hold courts of record for the trial of criminal offenses and misdemeanors" not made the subject of capital punishment, and also of civil cases where the cause of action shall not "exceed in value the amount or sum of lbs. 200."

(...)

The rapid extension of our settlements over our territories heretofore unoccupied, the addition of new States to our Confederacy, the expansion of free principles, and our rising greatness as a nation are attracting the attention of the powers of Europe, and lately the doctrine has been broached in some of them of a "balance of power" on this

continent to check our advancement. The United States, sincerely desirous of preserving relations of good understanding with all nations, can not in silence permit any European interference on the North American continent, and should any such interference be attempted will be ready to resist it at any and all hazards.

It is well known to the American people and to all nations that this Government has never interfered with the relations subsisting between other governments. We have never made ourselves parties to their wars or their alliances; we have not sought their territories by conquest; we have not mingled with parties in their domestic struggles; and believing our own form of government to be the best, we have never attempted to propagate it by intrigues, by diplomacy, or by force. We may claim on this continent a like exemption from European interference. The nations of America are equally sovereign and independent with those of Europe. They possess the same rights, independent of all foreign interposition, to make war, to conclude peace, and to regulate their internal affairs. The people of the United States can not, therefore, view with indifference attempts of European powers to interfere with the independent action of the nations on this continent. The American system of government is entirely different from that of Europe. Jealousy among the different sovereigns of Europe, lest any one of them might become too powerful for the rest, has caused them anxiously to desire the establishment of what they term the "balance of power." It can not be permitted to have any application on the North American continent, and especially to the United States. We must ever maintain the principle that the people of this continent alone have the right to decide their own destiny. Should any portion of them, constituting an independent state, propose to unite themselves with our Confederacy, this will be a question for them and us to determine without any foreign interposition. We can never consent that European powers shall interfere to prevent such a union because it might disturb the "balance of power" which they may desire to maintain upon this continent. Near a quarter of a century ago the principle was distinctly announced to the world, in the annual message of one of my predecessors, that –

The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for colonization by any European powers.

(...)

## Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, February 2, 1848

The consequence of the Texas' accession to the United States and the ultra-expansionist policy of President James Polk was the war between the United States and Mexico that erupted in 1846. As his desire was to broaden American territory to the Pacific coast, Polk declared the necessity to incorporate the territories of New Mexico and California that belonged to Mexico into the US borders. Earlier, in effect of the Texas accession to the Union, the Mexican government broke diplomatic relations with the United States. This decision did not help to resolve the difficult relations between the two countries. However, Polk's determination to seize Mexican territories had much more far reaching consequences. From the very beginning of his presidency, he took strong efforts to

achieve that aim. First, he tried to use negotiations and money to convince the Mexican government to sell New Mexico and California to the United States. That was the main goal of President Polk's special envoy to Mexico, John Slidel. He had instructions to propose the price of USD 5 million for the New Mexico territory and USD 25 million for California. However, his mission completely failed as Mexican authorities did not even begin negotiations due to their strong opposition to any ideas of border changes with its northern neighbor. James Polk was so determined to take over the Mexican territories that he decided to use military instruments. He ordered the deployment of the army led by General Zachary Taylor near the border with Mexico. He hoped to provoke a military incident that could be used as a *casus belli* and declare war on the southern neighbor. As the Mexican government and militaries were very cautious in their policy toward the United States, Polk began to lose patience. His determination was so strong that he decided to ask Congress to declare war on Mexico. According to Polk, the cause of war was the insult of American honor by the Mexican government as it did not commence negotiations with special envoy John Slidel. As the reason of war was quite ridiculous, Polk was lucky. Just as he was writing his message to Congress, he received information about an incident at the border with Mexico. Mexican troops had crossed the border with the United States and killed several American soldiers. In this case, Polk did not necessitate any sophisticated arguments for the use of American force against Mexico. Congress acknowledged this as an act of aggression against the United States.

The war between the United States and Mexico in the years 1846–1848 was not a spectacular one. There were no fierce battles with the expression of the unique strategic abilities of the commanders of both sides. Military operations were concentrated in the border region. The most sophisticated operation was the American invasion in the port of Veracruz and the march toward the Mexican capital. The operation started in March 1847 under Winfield Scott's command and ended in September 1847 when American troops entered Mexico City. This meant the final defeat of Mexico in the war with the United States. The Mexican government decided to start negotiations with US negotiator, Nicolas Trist. The final result was the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. In this treaty, the Mexican government agreed on the territorial changes proposed by the United States. Several American states: California, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, and partially Colorado and Wyoming were created on this area, sometimes referred to as the Mexican Cession. At the Treaty, both sides confirmed the border in Texas. As compensation for these territorial losses, the government of the United States had to pay USD 15 million.

The territorial acquisitions that were the result of the war with Mexico constitute the largest territorial purchase in the history of the United States. In Mexico, till the present day, the war of 1846–1848 is one of the biggest defeats in its history.

### Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, February 2, 1848

Source: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th\\_century/guadhida.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/guadhida.asp) (14.02.2013);

Treaties and other international acts of the United States, vol. 5, 1846–1852, ed. Hunter Miller, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1937; pp. 207–236



## TREATY OF PEACE, FRIENDSHIP, LIMITS, AND SETTLEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

### IN THE NAME OF ALMIGHTY GOD

The United States of America and the United Mexican States animated by a sincere desire to put an end to the calamities of the war which unhappily exists between the two Republics and to establish upon a solid basis relations of peace and friendship, which shall confer reciprocal benefits upon the citizens of both, and assure the concord, harmony, and mutual confidence wherein the two people should live, as good neighbors have for that purpose appointed their respective plenipotentiaries, that is to say: The President of the United States has appointed Nicholas P. Trist, a citizen of the United States, and the President of the Mexican Republic has appointed Don Luis Gonzaga Cuevas, Don Bernardo Couto, and Don Miguel Atristain, citizens of the said Republic; Who, after a reciprocal communication of their respective full powers, have, under the protection of Almighty God, the author of peace, arranged, agreed upon, and signed the following: Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits, and Settlement between the United States of America and the Mexican Republic.

(...)

### ARTICLE V

The boundary line between the two Republics shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, three leagues from land, opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande, otherwise called Rio Bravo del Norte, or Opposite the mouth of its deepest branch, if it should have more than one branch emptying directly into the sea; from thence up the middle of that river, following the deepest channel, where it has more than one, to the point where it strikes the southern boundary of New Mexico; thence, westwardly, along the whole southern boundary of New Mexico (which runs north of the town called Paso) to its western termination; thence, northward, along the western line of New Mexico, until it intersects the first branch of the river Gila; (or if it should not intersect any branch of that river, then to the point on the said line nearest to such branch, and thence in a direct line to the same); thence down the middle of the said branch and of the said river, until it empties into the Rio Colorado; thence across the Rio Colorado, following the division line between Upper and Lower California, to the Pacific Ocean.

The southern and western limits of New Mexico, mentioned in the article, are those laid down in the map entitled "Map of the United Mexican States, as organized and defined by various acts of the Congress of said republic, and constructed according to the best authorities. Revised edition. Published at New York, in 1847, by J. Disturnell," of which map a copy is added to this treaty, bearing the signatures and seals of the undersigned Plenipotentiaries. And, in order to preclude all difficulty in tracing upon the ground the limit separating Upper from Lower California, it is agreed that the said limit shall consist of a straight line drawn from the middle of the Rio Gila, where it unites with the Colorado, to a point on the coast of the Pacific Ocean, distant one marine league due south of the southernmost point of the port of San Diego, according to the plan of said port made in the year 1782 by Don Juan Pantoja, second sailing-master of the Spanish fleet, and published at Madrid in the year 1802, in the atlas to the voyage of the schooners Sutil and Mexicana; of which plan a copy is hereunto added, signed and sealed by the respective Plenipotentiaries.

In order to designate the boundary line with due precision, upon authoritative maps, and to establish upon the ground land-marks which shall show the limits of both republics, as described in the present article, the two Governments shall each appoint a commissioner and a surveyor, who, before the expiration of one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty, shall meet at the port of San Diego, and proceed to run and mark the said boundary in its whole course to the mouth of the Rio Bravo del Norte. They shall keep journals and make out plans of their operations; and the result agreed upon by them shall be deemed a part of this treaty, and shall have the same force as if it were inserted therein. The two Governments will amicably agree regarding what may be necessary to these persons, and also as to their respective escorts, should such be necessary.

The boundary line established by this article shall be religiously respected by each of the two republics, and no change shall ever be made therein, except by the express and free consent of both nations, lawfully given by the General Government of each, in conformity with its own constitution.

(...)

## ARTICLE XII

In consideration of the extension acquired by the boundaries of the United States, as defined in the fifth article of the present treaty, the Government of the United States engages to pay to that of the Mexican Republic the sum of fifteen millions of dollars.

Immediately after the treaty shall have been duly ratified by the Government of the Mexican Republic, the sum of three millions of dollars shall be paid to the said Government by that of the United States, at the city of Mexico, in the gold or silver coin of Mexico. The remaining twelve millions of dollars shall be paid at the same place, and in the same coin, in annual installments of three millions of dollars each, together with interest on the same at the rate of six per centum per annum. This interest shall begin to run upon the whole sum of twelve millions from the day of the ratification of the present treaty by the Mexican Government, and the first of the installments shall be paid at the expiration of one year from the same day. Together with each annual installment, as it falls due, the whole interest accruing on such installment from the beginning shall also be paid.

(...)

## ARTICLE XXIII

This treaty shall be ratified by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof; and by the President of the Mexican Republic, with the previous approbation of its general Congress; and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the City of Washington, or at the seat of Government of Mexico, in four months from the date of the signature hereof, or sooner if practicable. In faith whereof we, the respective Plenipotentiaries, have signed this treaty of peace, friendship, limits, and settlement, and have hereunto affixed our seals respectively. Done in quintuplicate, at the city of Guadalupe Hidalgo, on the second day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-eight.

N. P. Trist  
Luis P. Cuevas  
Bernardo Couto  
Migl. Atristain

## Chapter Two

# The Cuban-American Affairs

Bilateral relations between the United States and Cuba constitute one of the most important elements of the US Latin American policy. Since the beginning of its independence, politicians in the United States were thinking about Cuba and analyzed possible scenarios of the island's situation. The common element of those analyses were the conviction that it would be in the interest of the United States to incorporate the island. However, in the first decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century US politicians understood quite well that it would be too dangerous to act against the Spanish colony. Cuba always was and continues to be of huge importance for the geopolitical situation of the United States. Its geographical position and political situation always strongly influenced US foreign policy in the Latin American and Caribbean region. The importance of Cuba was already noticed by John Quincy Adams. Additionally in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, some US diplomats in Europe emphasized Cuba's importance for the future of the United States. It was not a coincidence that the United States directly engaged in the war against Spain, although, the argument of Cuban independence was treated by a majority of US politicians as an instrument of US expansion. It was obvious for US diplomacy that the United States should have utilized all possibilities to strengthen its position on the island. This is why the United States were looking for any possibilities of controlling Cuba's internal situation. The adoption of the so-called Platt Amendment was the perfect instrument to reach that goal. Cuba was also of great importance for the US in the economic dimension. American entrepreneurs had a lot of businesses in the island. In effect, in the sphere of the economy, as in the politics, Cuba was completely dominated by the United States. It is no surprise that any Cuban tendencies to change that situation were perceived in the United States as a threat to its interests. The Cuban revolution that started as a nationalist and anti-imperialist movement turned the island toward communism in a short time. The development of the Cuban revolution was fully contradictory to the US main doctrine of its foreign policy during the Cold War. This is why American diplomacy was ready to use all foreign policy instruments, including military ones. The challenge that Fidel Castro threw down to the United States determined all of the Latin American policy after 1959. The assumption of power in Cuba by Fidel Castro and his *barbudos*, created a situation of permanent conflict between the two countries. Cuba's leader questioned US unilateral domination in the Latin American and Caribbean region. In consequence, the bilateral relations between Cuba and the United States had affected the relations between those countries and the rest of the region on a large scale. It seems that relations with any

other country in the Western Hemisphere did not bear such a huge impact on US Latin American policy as its relations with Cuba.

## John Quincy Adams' Letter to Hugh Nelson, April 28, 1823

The beginning of the 1820s was the first time when the case of Cuba became an important issue for American foreign policy. Some politics in the United States were interested in Cuba for a long time; however the turmoil on the European continent as well as successful wars for independence in Latin America created conditions that made changes in the previous status of the island possible. After the chaos of the Napoleon era and in the effect of losing its colonies in Latin America, the Spanish monarchy became much weaker. Although, Ferdinand VII returned to the Spanish throne, a radical rebellion erupted in Spain in 1820. Rebels demanded the restoration of the liberal constitution that was adopted in 1812. There was fierce chaos in Spain in the first months of 1820. Ferdinand VII convoked Cortes but it was too late to stop the immediate changes. On March 7, 1820 Ferdinand VII restored the liberal constitution of 1812. After the First Vienna Congress and in the times of the Holy Alliance these kinds of changes could not remain without a strong reaction from the rest of the European powers. In fact, the liberal governments did not stabilize the situation in the country. Ferdinand was one of those that permanently conspired against the liberal authorities and strived for the restoration of his absolutist reign. Meanwhile in October 1822, the Holy Alliance congress was held in Verona to debate the situation in Spain. The representative of the countries that participated in the congress announced that the liberal constitution and the government in Spain were contradictory with the values established during the Vienna Congress in 1815. In the effect, it was necessary – according to the representatives – to introduce an order based on the Vienna provisions. The mission of resolving the “liberal problem” in Spain was entrusted to France. It took on the form of French military intervention in Spain that started on April 7, 1823.

The turmoil on the Iberian Peninsula had its impact in the New World. Firstly, the possible victory of France in its war with Spain could have significant consequences for the remaining Spanish colonies in the Western Hemisphere. At that time, their last colonies in the region were Cuba and Puerto Rico. The former had great significance specifically in the geopolitical situation. It was the first Spanish colony in the New World. For a long time Cuba was referred to as the Pearl of the Antilles due to the riches that it gave to Spain. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it has great symbolic importance to its metropolis. Spain, however, lost its imperial position a long time ago, other powers were carefully observing Cuba's situation and were looking for the possibility of taking it over. The most advanced in that kind of effort were Great Britain and the United States. For the latter Cuba was the natural direction of its expansion in the region. Americans had a lot

of businesses on the island. Also, the southern states of the Union wanted to strengthen its position in the struggle for the slavery and the incorporation of Cuba with its huge number of black slaves could help achieve that. The Secretary of State in the Monroe administration was conscious of the dangers that could result from the victorious French intervention in Spain. Also, aware of limited possibilities of the United States in the struggle for Cuba, he was convinced that the best option for the United States would be the continuation of Spanish rule in Cuba. That would prevent the appearance of a strong European power near the US borders. Also, the weaker Spain could be willing, in the future, to negotiate the situation of Cuba with the United States.

As a Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams wrote a long letter to the American minister in Madrid, Hugh Nelson. The letter explained the very nature of American foreign policy, the importance of Cuba for US national security and it included important instructions for Minister Hugh Nelson with regard to the policy he should carry out as an American diplomatic representative in Spain.

### John Quincy Adams to Hugh Nelson, April 28, 1823

Source: Writings of John Quincy Adams, vol VII, 1820–1823, ed. Worthington Chauncey Ford, Greenwood Press Publishers, New York, pp. 369–421

[http://archive.org/stream/fordsjohnadams07adamrich/fordsjohnadams07adamrich\\_djvu.txt](http://archive.org/stream/fordsjohnadams07adamrich/fordsjohnadams07adamrich_djvu.txt) (17.09.2013)

It has been a maxim in the policy of these United States, from the time when their independence was achieved, to keep themselves aloof from the political systems and contentions of Europe. To this principle it is yet the purpose of the President to adhere: and in the war about to commence, the attitude to be assumed and maintained by the United States will be that of neutrality.

But the experience of our national history has already shown that, however sincerely this policy was adopted, and however earnestly and perseveringly it was maintained, it yielded ultimately to a course of events by which the violence and injustice of European powers involved the immediate interests and brought in conflict the essential rights of our own country.

Two of the principal causes of the wars between the nations of Europe since that of our own Revolution, have been, indeed, the same as those in which that originated – civil liberty and national independence. To these principles, and to the cause of those who contend for them, the people of the United States can never be indifferent. A feeling of sympathy and of partiality for every nation struggling to secure or to defend these great interests, has been and will be manifested by this Union; and it is among the most difficult and delicate duties of the general government, in all its branches, to indulge this feeling so far as it may be compatible with the duties of neutrality, and to withhold and restrain from encroaching upon them. So far as it is indulged, its tendency is to involve us in foreign wars, while the first and paramount duty of the government is to maintain peace amidst all the convulsions of foreign wars, and to enter the lists as parties to no cause, other than our own.

In the maritime wars of Europe, we have, indeed, a direct and important interest of our own; as they are waged upon an element which is the common property of all; and as our participation in the possession of that property is perhaps greater than that of any other nation. The existence of maritime war, itself, enlarges and deepens the importance of this interest; and it introduces a state of things in which the conflict of neutral and belligerent rights becomes itself a continual and formidable instigation to war. To all maritime wars Great Britain can scarcely fail of becoming a party; and from that moment arises a collision between her and these states, peculiar to the situation, interests and rights of the two countries, and which can scarcely form a subject of discussion between any other nation and either of them.

This cause then is peculiarly our own: and we have already been once compelled to vindicate our rights implicated in it by war. It has been too among the dispensations of Providence, that the issue of that war should have left that question unsettled for the future; and that the attempt; which on the part of the United States have been repeatedly made since the peace for adjusting it by amicable negotiation, have in like manner proved ineffectual, therefore great reason to apprehend, that if Great Britain should engage in the war, now just kindled in Europe, the United States will again be called to support by all their energies, not excepting war, the rights of their national independence, enjoyed in the persons of their seamen.

But in the war between France and Spain now commencing, other interests, peculiarly ours, will in all probability be deeply involved. Whatever may be the issue of this war, as between those two European powers, it may be taken for granted that the dominion of Spain upon the American continents, North and South, is irrecoverably gone. But the islands of Cuba and of Porto Rico still remain nominally and so far really dependent upon her, that she yet possesses the power of transferring her own dominion over them, together with the possession of them, to others. These islands, from their local position, are natural appendages to the North American continent; and one of them, Cuba, almost in sight of our shores, from a multitude of considerations has become an object of transcendent importance to the political and commercial interests of our Union. Its commanding position with reference to the Gulf of Mexico and the West India seas; the character of its population; its situation midway between our southern coast and the island of San Domingo; its safe and capacious harbor of the Havana, fronting a long line of our shores destitute of the same advantage; the nature of its productions and of its wants, furnishing the supplies and needing the returns of a commerce immensely profitable and mutually beneficial; give it an importance in the sum of our national interests, with which that of no other foreign territory can be compared, and little inferior to that which binds the different members of this Union together.

Such indeed are, between the interests of that island and of this country, the geographical, commercial, moral, and political relations, formed by nature, gathering in the process of time, and even now verging to maturity, that in looking forward to the probable course of events for the short period of half a century, it is scarcely possible to resist the conviction that the annexation of Cuba to our federal republic will be indispensable to the continuance and integrity of the Union itself. It is obvious however that for this event we are not yet prepared. Numerous and formidable objections to the extension of our territorial dominions beyond the sea present themselves to the first contemplation of the subject. Obstacles to the system of policy by which it alone can be compassed and maintained are to be foreseen and surmounted, both from at home and abroad. But there are laws of political as well as of physical gravitation; and if an apple severed by the tempest from its native tree can not choose but fall to the ground, Cuba, forcibly disjoined from its own unnatural connection with Spain, and incapable of self-support, can gravitate only towards the North American Union, which by the same law of nature cannot cast her off from its bosom.

(...)

Were the population of the island of one blood and color, there could be no doubt or hesitation with regard to the course which they would pursue, as dictated by their interests and their rights. The invasion of Spain by France would be the signal for their Declaration of Independence. That even in their present state it will be imposed upon them as a necessity is not unlikely; but among all their reflecting men it is admitted as a maxim fundamental to all deliberation upon their future condition, that they are not competent to a system of permanent self-dependence. They must rely for the support of protection upon some force from without; and as, in the event of the overthrow of the Spanish constitution, that support can no longer be expected from Spain, their only alternative of dependence must be upon Great Britain, or upon the United States.

Hitherto the wishes of this government have been that the connection between Cuba and Spain should continue, as it has existed for several years. These wishes are known to the principal inhabitants of the island, and instructions, copies of which are now furnished you, were some months since transmitted to Mr. Forsyth, authorizing him in a suitable manner to communicate them to the Spanish government. These wishes still continue, so far as they indulged with a rational foresight of events beyond our control, but for which it is our duty to be prepared government is to be imposed by foreign violence upon the Spanish nation, and the liberties which they have; by their constitution are to be crushed, it is neither expected nor desired that the people of Cuba, far from the reach of the oppressors of Spain, should submit to be governed by them. Should the cause of Spain herself issue more propitiously than from its present prospects can be anticipated, it is obvious that the trial through must pass at home, and the final loss of all her dominions on the American continents, will leave her unable to extend to the island of Cuba that protection necessary for its internal security and its outward defence.

(...)

The transfer of Cuba to Great Britain would be an event unpropitious to the interests of this Union. This opinion is so generally entertained, that even the groundless rumors that it was about to be accomplished, which have spread abroad and are still teeming, may be traced to the deep and almost universal feeling of aversion to it, and to the alarm which the mere probability of its occurrence has stimulated. The question both of our right and our power to prevent it, if necessary, by force, already obtrudes itself upon our councils, and the administration is called upon, in the performance of its duties to the nation, at least to use all the means within its competency to guard against and forefend it.

It will be among the primary objects requiring your most earnest and unremitting attention, to ascertain and report to us any movement of negotiation between Spain and Great Britain upon this subject. We cannot indeed prescribe any special instructions in relation to it. We scarcely know where you will find the government of Spain upon your arrival in the country; nor can we foresee with certainty by whom it will be administered. Your credentials are addressed to Ferdinand, the king of Spain under the constitution. You may find him under the guardianship of a Cortes, in the custody of an Army of Faith, or under the protection of the invaders of his country, the constitutional government may continue to be administered in his name, your official intercourse will be with his ministers; and to them you will repeat what Mr. Forsyth has been instructed to say, that the wishes of your government are, that Cuba and Porto Rico may continue in connection with independent and constitutional Spain. You will add, that no countenance has been given by us to any projected plan of separation from Spain, which may have been formed in the island. This assurance becomes proper, as, by a late despatch received from Mr. Forsyth, he intimates that the Spanish government have been informed, that a revolution in Cuba was secretly preparing, fomented by communications between a society of Free Masons there, and another of the same fraternity in Philadelphia. Of this we have no other knowledge: and the societies of Free Masons in this country are so little in the practice of using agency of a political nature on any occasion, that we think it most probable the information of the Spanish government in that respect is unfounded. It is true

that the Free Masons at the Havana have taken part of late in the politics of Cuba; and so far as it is known to us, it has been an earnest and active part in favor of the continuance of their connection with Spain.

## The Ostend Manifest, October 15, 1854

In the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, American diplomacy very carefully observed the situation of Cuba. Almost every administration was conscious of the importance of the island for the United States. Simultaneously, the decline of Spanish power in international relations had made the case of Cuba a very hot issue. As it was presented in the letter of John Quincy Adams to the US minister in Spain, American diplomacy was afraid of possible changes in the possession of last Spanish colonies, including Cuba already in the 1820s. The high importance of the island for the United States was also a part of Franklin Pierce's administration's foreign policy. The President asked his ambassadors in Great Britain, France and Spain to prepare recommendations for American diplomacy about their policy regarding Cuba. The ambassadors – James Buchanan, John Y. Mayson and Pierre Soulé – met several times in Europe to discuss this subject. The final meeting took place in Aix-la-Chapelle, however the main conclusions were formulated in the earlier meeting that took place in October at Ostend, Belgium. During this conference they formulated a document that included their recommendations for the US policy toward Cuba. They underlined the significance of the island for the United States, principally from the national security perspective. As the island was perceived by the ambassadors as the main element of national security building, they advised direct activities toward the process of the Cuba purchase. They advised President Pierce to use all possible instruments of American foreign policy to achieve that goal. The most proper one was – according to the ambassadors – a proposition of buying the Spanish colony. They had put attention on the bad economic situation of Spain and the financial problems of the Spanish government. The ambassadors were convinced that Spanish authorities would consider an interesting offer proposed by the United States. If Spain expressed no interest in selling the island, the United States should consider using other instruments, including military ones. This suggestion shows how strong the US's conviction on Cuba's significance for the United States really was.

The so-called Ostend Manifest was a secret message of the ambassadors to the president of the United States. However it turned public and it spawned a real outrage in the international diplomacy as official American diplomats were advising the President of the United States to use military power to purchase the island of Cuba.



## The Ostend Manifest, 1854

Source: <http://www.historyofcuba.com/history/havana/Ostend2.htm> (18.09.2013)

Aix-la-Chapelle,  
October 15, 1854

Sir:

The undersigned, in compliance with the wish expressed by the President in the several confidential dispatches you have addressed to us, respectively, to that effect, have met in conference, first at Ostend, in Belgium, on the 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 11<sup>th</sup> instants, and then at Aix-la-Chapelle, in Prussia, on the days next following, up to the date hereof.

There has been a full and unreserved interchange of views and sentiments between us, which we are most happy to inform you has resulted in a cordial coincidence of opinion on the grave and important subjects submitted to our consideration.

We have arrived at the conclusion, and are thoroughly convinced, that an immediate and earnest effort ought to be made by the government of the United States to purchase Cuba from Spain at any price for which it can be obtained, not exceeding the sum of \$ (this item was left blank).

The proposal should, in our opinion, be made in such a manner as to be presented through the necessary diplomatic forms to the Supreme Constituent Cortes about to assemble. On this momentous question, in which the people both of Spain and the United States are so deeply interested, all our proceedings ought to be open, frank, and public. They should be of such a character as to challenge the approbation of the world.

We firmly believe that, in the progress of human events, the time has arrived when the vital interests of Spain are as seriously involved in the sale, as those of the United States in the purchase of the island, and that the transaction will prove equally honorable to both nations.

Under these circumstances we cannot anticipate a failure, unless possibly through the malign influence of foreign powers who possess no right whatever to interfere in the matter.

We proceed to state some of the reasons which have brought us to this conclusion, and, for the sake of clearness, we shall specify them under two distinct heads:

1. The United States ought, if practicable, to purchase Cuba with as little delay as possible. 2. The probability is great that the government and Cortes of Spain will prove willing to sell it, because this would essentially promote the highest and best interests of the Spanish people.

Then 1. It must be clear to every reflecting mind that, from the peculiarity of its geographical position, and the considerations attendant on it, Cuba is as necessary to the North American republic as any of its present members, and that it belongs naturally to that great family of states of which the Union is the providential nursery.

From its locality it commands the mouth of the Mississippi and the immense and annually increasing trade which must seek this avenue to the ocean.

On the numerous navigable streams, measuring an aggregate course of some thirty thousand miles, which disembogue themselves through this river into the Gulf of Mexico, the increase of the population within the last ten years amounts to more than that of the entire Union at the time Louisiana was annexed to it.

The natural and main outlet to the products of this entire population, the highway of their direct intercourse with the Atlantic and Pacific states, can never be secure, but must ever

be endangered whilst Cuba is a dependency of a distant power in whose possession it had proved to be a source of constant annoyance and embarrassment to their interests.

Indeed the Union can never enjoy repose, nor possess reliable security, as long as Cuba is not embraced within its boundaries.

Its immediate acquisition by our government is of paramount importance, and we cannot doubt but that it is a consummation devoutly wished for by its inhabitants.

The intercourse which its proximity to our coasts begets and encourages between them and the citizens of the United States has, in the progress of time, so united their interests and blended their fortunes that they now look upon each other as if they were one people and had but one destiny.

Considerations exist which render delay in the acquisition of the island exceedingly dangerous to the United States.

The system of immigration and labor, lately organized within its limits, and the tyranny and oppression which characterize its immediate rulers, threaten an insurrection at every moment which may result in direful consequences to the American people.

Cuba has thus become to us an unceasing danger, and a permanent cause of anxiety and alarm.

But we need not enlarge on these topics. It can scarcely be apprehended that foreign powers, in violation of international law, would interpose their influence with Spain to prevent our acquisition of the island. Its inhabitants are now suffering under the worst of all possible governments – that of absolute despotism delegated by a distant power to irresponsible agents, who are changed at short intervals, and who are tempted to improve the brief opportunity thus afforded to accumulate fortunes by the basest means.

As long as this system shall endure, humanity may in vain demand the suppression of the African slave-trade in the island. This is rendered impossible whilst that infamous traffic remains an irresistible temptation and a source of immense profit to needy and avaricious officials, who, to attain their ends, scruple not to trample the most sacred principles under foot.

The Spanish government, at home, may be well disposed, but experience has proved that it cannot control these remote depositaries of its power.

(...)

But if Spain, deaf to the voice of her own interests, and actuated by stubborn pride and a false sense of honor, should refuse to sell Cuba to the United States, then the question will arise: What ought to be the course of the American government under such circumstances?

Self-preservation is the law of states as well as with individuals. All nations have, at different periods, acted upon this maxim. Although it has been made the pretext for committing flagrant injustice, as in the partition of Poland and other similar cases which history records, yet the principle itself, though often abused, has always been recognized.

The United States have never acquired a foot of territory excerpt by fair purchase, or, as in the case of Texas, upon the free and voluntary application of the people of that independent state, who desired to blend their destinies with our own.

Even our acquisitions from Mexico are no exception to this rule, because, although we might have claimed them by right of conquest in a just war, yet we purchased them for what was then considered by both parties a full and ample equivalent.

(...)

After we shall have offered Spain a price for Cuba far beyond its present value, and this shall have been refused, it will then be time to consider the question; does Cuba, in the possession of Spain, seriously endanger our internal peace and the existence of our cherished Union?

Should this question be answered in the affirmative, then, by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it from Spain, if we possess the power; and this upon the very same principle that would justify an individual in tearing down the burning house of his neighbor if there were no other means of preventing the flames from destroying his own home.

Under such circumstances we ought neither to count the cost nor regard the odds which Spain might enlist against us. We forbear to enter into the question whether the present condition of the island would justify such a measure. We should, however, be recreant to our duty, be unworthy of our gallant forefathers, and commit base treason against our posterity, should we permit Cuba to be Africanized and become a second St. Domingo, with all its attendant horrors to the white race, and suffer the flames to extend to our own neighboring shores, seriously to endanger our actually to consume the fair fabric of our Union.

We fear that the course and current of events are rapidly tending toward such a catastrophe. We, however, hope for the best, though we ought certainly to be prepared for the worst.

(...)

Yours very respectfully,  
James Buchanan  
John Y. Mason  
Pierre Soulé

## José Martí, Nuestra America (Our America), January 30, 1891

As South America had Simón Bolívar or José de San Martín, Cuba had José Martí. One could say that Martí was the last great liberator of Latin America. However, he did not fight outside Cuba, he still is one of the most important “founding fathers” of Latin America. He is the greatest Cuban national hero. His contribution to strengthening Latin American identity is commonly known in other Latin American states. He was not a famous military leader, although he took part in Cuba’s struggles for independence. His greatest achievements are his ideas that defined Latin America, its citizens and strongly condemned any interference of other states in the Latin American affairs. He is one of the most important Latin American intellectuals of the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. As he participated in the independence insurrection in Cuba, he had to leave the island after its collapse. In 1891, he was in Mexico City. It was there that he presented his famous “Nuestra America” (Our America) Speech. The speech was the great exemplification of

Martí's ideas about Latin America. He emphasized the fundamental law of Latin America to be independent from all European, as well as North American interferences. In his reflections about the region and its citizens, Martí presented similar views to Bolívar and other *Libertadores*. He put attention to the necessity of maintaining unity among Latin American states. Similarly to Bolívar, he perceived it as a main factor that could help in building strong, independent countries. In his writings, also in "Nuestra America," he referred to the common heritage of Latin America, the roots and foundations of which are stuck in the pre-Colombian cultures and civilizations. This is also the genesis of the citizens of Latin America. They had pre-Colombian roots, hence Indians are inseparable element of Latin American nations, together with Creoles – white men born in Latin America and contributing to the development of her culture. All those who feel more European or do not feel their union with Latin America should return to their motherland

(Only runts whose growth was stunted will lack the necessary valor, for those who have no faith in their land are like men born prematurely. Having no valor themselves, they deny that other men do. Their puny arms, with bracelets and painted nails, the arms of Madrid or of Paris, cannot manage the lofty tree and so they say the tree cannot be climbed. We must load up the ships with these termites who gnaw away at the core of the patria that has nurtured them; if they are Parisians or Madrileños then let them stroll to the Prado by lamplight or go to Tortoni's for an ice. These sons of carpenters who are ashamed that their father was a carpenter! These men born in America who are ashamed of the mother that raised them because she wears an Indian apron, these delinquents who disown their sick mother and leave her alone in her sickbed!).

For Martí, Latin American history should be an inspiration for building strong nations within strong states. In "Nuestra America" he also underlined the differences and contradictions between the European political system and American republicanism. He perceived the republican government as a natural for the Western Hemisphere, including of course, Latin America. But – as he correctly pointed out – to govern in a proper way, there is a great need of educated people in Latin America. That is why there should be a growing number of universities in Latin American countries that would teach about the problems of Latin America and particular states. This is the main objective of education because to carry out good governance, Latin American countries need people who know their problems – not the problems or successes of the European states. The new governments that know the problems of their states, and know their culture and tradition, wanted – according to Martí – to serve their citizens. That was the main difference in the idea of the government. The colonial system and authorities were corrupted and were not interested in serving the inhabitants.

What differentiates José Martí from his predecessors is his anti-Americanism. He warned Latin Americans of the dangers that can emerge from the United States. For him there was no difference between European colonial powers or the United States. The latter was even worse because they emerged as a nation liberated from the chains of colonialism, meanwhile in the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century started to implement the same colonial policy. It is not difficult to explicate José Martí's strong anti-Americanism. At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the ideas of US expansion were broadly known also outside the United States. He also has the experience of direct observation of the evolution of American foreign policy toward Latin American states. A policy that was getting more and more aggressive.

Undoubtedly, José Martí's ideas were very influential at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Not only in Cuba – which, at that time, was struggling for its independence – but in all of the Latin American regions. They survived for a long time. During the revolutions in Cuba in 1933 and in the end of the 1950s the main figures made references to Martí. For many years, he was mentioned alongside such great persons as Bolívar, San Martín, Sucre or Haya de la Torre.

José Martí, *Nuestra America*, January 30, 1891

Source: Jose Marti, *Nuestra America*, Fundación Biblioteca Ayacucho, pp. 31–39

Cree el aldeano vanidoso que el mundo entero es su aldea, y con tal que él quede de alcalde, o le mortifique al rival que le quitó la novia, o le crezcan en la alcancía los ahorros, ya da por bueno el orden universal, sin saber de los gigantes que llevan siete leguas en las botas y le pueden poner la bota encima, ni de la pelea de los cometas en el Cielo, que van por el aire dormidos engullendo mundos. Lo que quede de aldea en América ha de despertar. Estos tiempos no son para acostarse con el pañuelo a la cabeza, sino con las armas de almohada, como los varones de Juan de Castellanos: las armas del juicio, que vencen a las otras. Trincheras de ideas valen más que trincheras de piedra.

No hay proa que taje una nube de ideas. Una idea enérgica, flameada a tiempo ante el mundo, para, como la bandera mística del juicio final, a un escuadrón de acorazados. Los pueblos que no se conocen han de darse prisa para conocerse, como quienes van a pelear juntos. Los que se enseñan los puños, como hermanos celosos, que quieren los dos la misma tierra, o el de casa chica, que le tiene envidia al de casa mejor, han de encajar, de modo que sean una, las dos manos. Los que, al amparo de una tradición criminal, cercenaron, con el sable tinto en la sangre de sus mismas venas, la tierra del hermano vencido, del hermano castigado más allá de sus culpas, si no quieren que les llame el pueblo ladrones, devuélvanle sus tierras al hermano. Las deudas del honor no las cobra el honrado en dinero, a tanto por la bofetada. Ya no podemos ser el pueblo de hojas, que vive en el aire, con la copa cargada de flor, restallando o zumbando, según la acaricie el capricho de la luz, o la tundan y talen las tempestades; ilos árboles se han de poner en fila, para que no pase el gigante de las siete leguas! Es la hora del recuento, y de la marcha unida, y hemos de andar en cuadro apretado, como la plata en las raíces de los Andes. A los sietemesinos sólo les faltará el valor. Los que no tienen fe en su tierra son hombres de siete meses. Porque les falta el valor a ellos, se lo niegan a los demás. No les alcanza al árbol difícil el brazo canijo, el brazo de uñas pintadas y pulsera, el brazo de Madrid o de París, y dicen que no se puede alcanzar el árbol. Hay que cargar los barcos de esos insectos dañinos, que le roen el hueso a la patria que los nutre. Si son parisienes o madrileños, vayan al Prado, de faroles, o vayan a Tortoni, de sorbetes. ¡Estos hijos de carpinteros, que se avergüenzan de que su padre sea carpintero! ¡Estos nacidos en América, que se avergüenzan, porque llevan delantal indio, de la madre que los crió, y reniegan, ibribones!, de la madre enferma, y la dejan sola en el lecho de las enfermedades! Pues, ¿quién es el hombre? ¿el que se queda con la madre, a curarle la enfermedad, o el que la pone a trabajar donde no la vean, y vive de su sustento en las tierras podridas, con el gusano de corbata, maldiciendo del seno que lo cargó, paseando el letrero de traidor en la espalda de la casaca de papel? ¡Estos hijos de nuestra América, que ha de salvarse con sus indios, y va de menos a más; estos desertores que piden fusil en los ejércitos de la América del Norte, que ahoga en sangre a sus indios, y va de más a menos! ¡Estos delicados, que son hombres y no quieren hacer el trabajo de hom-

bres! Pues el Washington que les hizo esta tierra ¿se fue a vivir con los ingleses, a vivir con los ingleses en los años en que los veía venir contra su tierra propia? ¡Estos "increíbles" del honor, que lo arrastran por el suelo extranjero, como los increíbles de la Revolución francesa, danzando y relamiéndose, arrastraban las erres!

Ni ¿en qué patria puede tener un hombre más orgullo que en nuestras repúblicas dolorosas de América, levantadas entre las masas mudas de indios, al ruido de pelea del libro con el cirial, sobre los brazos sangrientos de un centenar de apóstoles? De factores tan descompuestos, jamás, en menos tiempo histórico, se han creado naciones tan adelantadas y compactas. Cree el soberbio que la tierra fue hecha para servirle de pedestal, porque tiene la pluma fácil o la palabra de colores, y acusa de incapaz e irremediable a su república nativa, porque no le dan sus selvas nuevas modo continuo de ir por el mundo de gamonal famoso, guiando jacas de Persia y derramando champaña. La incapacidad no está en el país naciente, que pide formas que se le acomoden y grandeza útil, sino en los que quieren regir pueblos originales, de composición singular y violenta, con leyes heredadas de cuatro siglos de práctica libre en los Estados Unidos, de diecinueve siglos de monarquía en Francia. Con un decreto de Hamilton no se le para la pechada al potro del llanero. Con una frase de Sieyès no se desestanca la sangre cuajada de la raza india. A lo que es, allí donde se gobierna, hay que atender para gobernar bien; y el buen gobernante en América no es el que sabe cómo se gobierna el alemán o el francés, sino el que sabe con qué elementos está hecho su país, y cómo puede ir guiándolos en junto, para llegar, por métodos e instituciones nacidas del país mismo, a aquel estado apetecible donde cada hombre se conoce y ejerce, y disfrutan todos de la abundancia que la Naturaleza puso para todos en el pueblo que fecundan con su trabajo y defienden con sus vidas. El gobierno ha de nacer del país. El espíritu del gobierno ha de ser el del país. La forma del gobierno ha de avenirse a la constitución propia del país. El gobierno no es más que el equilibrio de los elementos naturales del país. Por eso el libro importado ha sido vencido en América por el hombre natural. Los hombres naturales han vencido a los letrados artificiales. El mestizo autóctono ha vencido al criollo exótico. No hay batalla entre la civilización y la barbarie, sino entre la falsa erudición y la naturaleza. El hombre natural es bueno, y acata y premia la inteligencia superior, mientras ésta no se vale de su sumisión para dañarle, o le ofende prescindiendo de él, que es cosa que no perdona el hombre natural, dispuesto a recobrar por la fuerza el respeto de quien le hiere la susceptibilidad o le perjudica el interés. Por esta conformidad con los elementos naturales desdeñados han subido los tiranos de América al poder; y han caído en cuanto les hicieron traición. Las repúblicas han purgado en las tiranías su incapacidad para conocer los elementos verdaderos del país, derivar de ellos la forma de gobierno y gobernar con ellos. Gobernante, en un pueblo nuevo, quiere decir creador. En pueblos compuestos de elementos cultos e incultos, los incultos gobernarán, por su hábito de agredir y resolver las dudas con su mano, allí donde los cultos no aprendan el arte del gobierno. La masa inculta es perezosa, y tímida en las cosas de la inteligencia, y quiere que la gobiernen bien; pero si el gobierno le lastima, se lo sacude y gobierna ella. ¿Cómo han de salir de las universidades los gobernantes, si no hay universidad en América donde se enseñe lo rudimentario del arte del gobierno, que es el análisis de los elementos peculiares de los pueblos de América? A adivinar salen los jóvenes al mundo, con antiparras yanquis o francesas, y aspiran a dirigir un pueblo que no conocen. En la carrera de la política habría de negarse la entrada a los que desconocen los rudimentos de la política. El premio de los certámenes no ha de ser para la mejor oda, sino para el mejor estudio de los factores del país en que se vive. En el periódico, en la cátedra, en la academia, debe llevarse adelante el estudio de los factores reales del país. Conocerlos basta, sin vendas ni ambages; porque el que pone de lado, por voluntad u olvido, una parte de la verdad, cae a la larga por la verdad que le faltó, que crece en la negligencia, y derriba lo que se levanta sin ella. Resolver el problema después de conocer sus elementos, es más fácil que resolver el problema sin conocerlos. Viene el hombre natural, indignado y fuerte, y derriba la justicia acumulada de los libros, porque no se la administra en acuerdo con las necesidades patentes del país. Conocer es resolver. Conocer el país, y gobernarlo conforme al conocimiento, es el único modo de librarlo de tiranías. La universidad euro-

pea ha de ceder a la universidad americana. La historia de América, de los incas acá, ha de enseñarse al dedillo, aunque no se enseñe la de los arcontes de Grecia. Nuestra Grecia es preferible a la Grecia que no es nuestra. Nos es más necesaria. Los políticos nacionales han de reemplazar a los políticos exóticos. Injértese en nuestras repúblicas el mundo; pero el tronco ha de ser el de nuestras repúblicas. Y calle el pedante vencido; que no hay patria en que pueda tener el hombre más orgullo que en nuestras dolorosas repúblicas americanas.

Con los pies en el rosario, la cabeza blanca y el cuerpo pinto de indio y criollo, vinimos, denodados, al mundo de las naciones. Con el estandarte de la Virgen salimos a la conquista de la libertad. Un cura, unos cuantos tenientes y una mujer alzan en México la república, en hombros de los indios. Un canónigo español, a la sombra de su capa, instruye en la libertad francesa a unos cuantos bachilleres magníficos, que ponen de jefe de Centro América contra España al general de España. Con los hábitos monárquicos, y el Sol por pecho, se echaron a levantar pueblos los venezolanos por el Norte y los argentinos por el Sur. Cuando los dos héroes chocaron, y el continente iba a temblar, uno, que no fue el menos grande, volvió riendas. Y como el heroísmo en la paz es más escaso, porque es menos glorioso que el de la guerra; como al hombre le es más fácil morir con honra que pensar con orden; como gobernar con los sentimientos exaltados y unánimes es más hacedero que dirigir, después de la pelea, los pensamientos diversos, arrogantes, exóticos o ambiciosos: como los poderes arrollados en la arremetida épica zapaban, con la cautela felina de la especie y el peso de lo real, el edificio que había izado, en las comarcas burdas y singulares de nuestra América mestiza, en los pueblos de pierna desnuda y casaca de París, la bandera de los pueblos nutridos de savia gobernante en la práctica continua de la razón y de la libertad; como la constitución jerárquica de las colonias resistía la organización democrática de la República, o las capitales de corbatín dejaban en el zaguán al campo de bota de potro, o los redentores bibliógenos no entendieron que la revolución que triunfó con el alma de la tierra, desatada a la voz del salvador, con el alma de la tierra había de gobernar, y no contra ella ni sin ella, entró a padecer América, y padece, de la fatiga de acomodación entre los elementos discordantes y hostiles que heredó de un colonizador despótico y avieso, y las ideas y formas importadas que han venido retardando, por su falta de realidad local, el gobierno lógico. El continente descoyuntado durante tres siglos por un mando que negaba el derecho del hombre al ejercicio de su razón, entró, desatendiendo o desoyendo a los ignorantes que lo habían ayudado a redimirse, en un gobierno que tenía por base la razón; la razón de todos en las cosas de todos, y no la razón universitaria de unos sobre la razón campestre de otros. El problema de la independencia no era el cambio de formas, sino el cambio de espíritu. Con los oprimidos había que hacer causa común, para afianzar el sistema opuesto a los intereses y hábitos de mando de los opresores. El tigre, espantado del fogonazo, vuelve de noche al lugar de la presa. Muere echando llamas por los ojos y con las zarpas al aire. No se le oye venir, sino que viene con zarpas de terciopelo. Cuando la presa despierta, tiene al tigre encima. La colonia continuó viviendo en la república; y nuestra América se está salvando de sus grandes yerros – de la soberbia de las ciudades capitales, del triunfo ciego de los campesinos desdeñados, de la importación excesiva de las ideas y fórmulas ajenas, del desdén inicuo e impolítico de la raza aborigen –, por la virtud superior, abonada con sangre necesaria, de la república que lucha contra la colonia. El tigre espera, detrás de cada árbol, acurrucado en cada esquina. Morirá, con las zarpas al aire, echando llamas por los ojos.

Pero “estos países se salvarán,” como anunció Rivadavia el argentino, el que pecó de finura en tiempos crudos; al machete no le va vaina de seda, ni en el país que se ganó con lanzón se puede echar el lanzón atrás, porque se enoja y se pone en la puerta del Congreso de Iturbide “a que le hagan emperador al rubio.” Estos países se salvarán porque, con el genio de la moderación que parece imperar, por la armonía serena de la Naturaleza, en el continente de la luz, y por el influjo de la lectura crítica que ha sucedido en Europa a la lectura de tanteo y falansterio en que se empapó la generación anterior, le está naciendo a América, en estos tiempos reales, el hombre real. Éramos una

visión, con el pecho de atleta, las manos de petimetre y la frente de niño. Éramos una máscara, con los calzones de Inglaterra, el chaleco parisiense, el chaquetón de Norteamérica y la montera de España. El indio, mudo, nos daba vueltas alrededor, y se iba al monte, a la cumbre del monte, a bautizar sus hijos. El negro, oteado, cantaba en la noche la música de su corazón, solo y desconocido, entre las olas y las fieras. El campesino, el creador, se revolvía, ciego de indignación, contra la ciudad desdeñosa, contra su criatura. Éramos charreteras y togas, en países que venían al mundo con la alpargata en los pies y la vincha en la cabeza. El genio hubiera estado en hermanar, con la caridad del corazón y con el atrevimiento de los fundadores, la vincha y la toga; en desestancar al indio; en ir haciendo lado al negro suficiente; en ajustar la libertad al cuerpo de los que se alzaron y vencieron por ella. Nos quedó el oidor, y el general, y el letrado, y el prebendado. La juventud angélica, como de los brazos de un pulpo, echaba al Cielo, para caer con gloria estéril, la cabeza, coronada de nubes. El pueblo natural, con el empuje del instinto, arrollaba, ciego del triunfo, los bastones de oro. Ni el libro europeo, ni el libro yanqui, daban la clave del enigma hispanoamericano. Se probó el odio, y los países venían cada año a menos. Cansados del odio inútil, de la resistencia del libro contra la lanza, de la razón contra el cirial, de la ciudad contra el campo, del imperio imposible de las castas urbanas divididas sobre la nación natural, tempestuosa o inerte, se empieza, como sin saberlo, a probar el amor. Se ponen en pie los pueblos, y se saludan. "¿Cómo somos?" se preguntan; y unos a otros se van diciendo cómo son. Cuando aparece en Cojimar un problema, no van a buscar la solución a Dantzig. Las levitas son todavía de Francia, pero el pensamiento empieza a ser de América. Los jóvenes de América se ponen la camisa al codo, hunden las manos en la masa, y la levantan con la levadura de su sudor. Entienden que se imita demasiado, y que la salvación está en crear. Crear es la palabra de pase de esta generación. El vino, de plátano; y si sale agrio, ¡es nuestro vino! Se entiende que las formas de gobierno de un país han de acomodarse a sus elementos naturales; que las ideas absolutas, para no caer por un yerro de forma, han de ponerse en formas relativas; que la libertad, para ser viable, tiene que ser sincera y plena; que si la república no abre los brazos a todos y adelanta con todos, muere la república. El tigre de adentro se entra por la hendidura, y el tigre de afuera. El general sujeta en la marcha la caballería al paso de los infantes. O si deja a la zaga a los infantes, le envuelve el enemigo la caballería. Estrategia es política. Los pueblos han de vivir criticándose, porque la crítica es la salud; pero con un solo pecho y una sola mente. ¡Bajarse hasta los infelices y alzarlos en los brazos! ¡Con el fuego del corazón deshelar la América coagulada! ¡Echar, bullendo y rebotando, por las venas, la sangre natural del país! En pie, con los ojos alegres de los trabajadores, se saludan, de un pueblo a otro, los hombres nuevos americanos. Surgen los estadistas naturales del estudio directo de la Naturaleza. Leen para aplicar, pero no para copiar. Los economistas estudian la dificultad en sus orígenes. Los oradores empiezan a ser sobrios. Los dramaturgos traen los caracteres nativos a la escena. Las academias discuten temas viables. La poesía se corta la melena zorrillesca y cuelga del árbol glorioso el chaleco colorado. La prosa, centelleante y cernida, va cargada de idea. Los gobernadores, en las repúblicas de indios, aprenden indio. De todos sus peligros se va salvando América. Sobre algunas repúblicas está durmiendo el pulpo. Otras, por la ley del equilibrio, se echan a pie a la mar, a recobrar, con prisa loca y sublime, los siglos perdidos. Otras, olvidando que Juárez paseaba en un coche de mulas, ponen coche de viento y de cocherito a una pompa de jabón; el lujo venenoso, enemigo de la libertad, pudre al hombre liviano y abre la puerta al extranjero. Otras acendran, con el espíritu épico de la independencia amenazada, el carácter viril. Otras crían, en la guerra rapaz contra el vecino, la soldadesca que puede devorarlas. Pero otro peligro corre, acaso, nuestra América, que no le viene de sí, sino de la diferencia de orígenes, métodos e intereses entre los dos factores continentales, y es la hora próxima en que se le acerque, demandando relaciones íntimas, un pueblo emprendedor y pujante que la desconoce y la desdeña. Y como los pueblos viriles, que se han hecho de sí propios, con la escopeta y la ley, aman, y sólo aman, a los pueblos viriles; como la hora del desfreno y la ambición, de que acaso se libre, por el predominio de lo más puro de su sangre, la América del Norte, o en que pudieran lanzarla sus masas vengativas y sórdidas, la tradición de conquista y el interés de un caudillo hábil, no está tan cercana aún a los



ojos del más espantadizo, que no dé tiempo a la prueba de altivez, continua y discreta, con que se la pud era encarar y desviarla; como su decoro de república pone a la América del Norte, ante los pueblos atentos del Universo, un freno que no le ha de quitar la provocación pueril o la arrogancia ostentosa, o la discordia parricida de nuestra América, el deber urgente de nuestra América es enseñarse como es, una en alma e intento, vencedora veloz de un pasado sofocante, manchada sólo con la sangre de abono que arranca a las manos la pelea con las ruinas, y la de las venas que nos dejaron picadas nuestros dueños. El desdén del vecino formidable, que no la conoce, es el peligro mayor de nuestra América; y urge, porque el día de la visita está próximo, que el vecino la conozca, la conozca pronto, para que no la desdeñe. Por ignorancia llegaría, tal vez, a poner en ella la codicia. Por el respeto, luego que la conociese, sacaría de ella las manos. Se ha de tener fe en lo mejor del hombre y desconfiar de lo peor de él. Hay que dar ocasión a lo mejor para que se revele y prevalezca sobre lo peor. Si no, lo peor prevalece. Los pueblos han de tener una picota para quien les azuza a odios inútiles; y otra para quien no les dice a tiempo la verdad. No hay odio de razas, porque no hay razas. Los pensadores canijos, los pensadores de lámparas, enhebran y recalientan las razas de librería, que el viajero justo y el observador cordial buscan en vano en la justicia de la Naturaleza, donde resalta en el amor victorioso y el apetito turbulento, la identidad universal del hombre. El alma emana, igual y eterna, de los cuerpos diversos en forma y en color. Peca contra la Humanidad el que fomente y propague la oposición y el odio de las razas. Pero en el amasijo de los pueblos se condensan, en la cercanía de otros pueblos diversos, caracteres peculiares y activos, de ideas y de hábitos, de ensanche y adquisición, de vanidad y de avaricia, que del estado latente de preocupaciones nacionales pudieran, en un período de desorden interno o de precipitación del carácter acumulado del país, trocarse en amenaza grave para las tierras vecinas, aisladas y débiles, que el país fuerte declara perecederas e inferiores. Pensar es servir. Ni ha de suponerse, por antipatía de aldea, una maldad ingénita y fatal al pueblo rubio del continente, porque no habla nuestro idioma, ni ve la casa como nosotros la vemos, ni se nos parece en sus lacras políticas, que son diferentes de las nuestras; ni tiene en mucho a los hombres biliosos y trigueños, ni mira caritativo, desde su eminencia aún mal segura, a los que, con menos favor de la Historia, suben a tramos heroicos la vía de las repúblicas; ni se han de esconder los datos patentes del problema que puede resolverse, para la paz de los siglos, con el estudio oportuno y la unión tácita y urgente del alma continental. ¡Porque ya suena el himno unánime; la generación actual lleva a cuestras, por el camino abonado por los padres sublimes, la América trabajadora; del Bravo a Magallanes, sentado en el lomo del cóndor, regó el Gran Semí, por las naciones románticas del continente y por las islas dolorosas del mar, la semilla de la América nueva!

## The Decision to Act Against Spain, William McKinley, April 11, 1898

As the United States recovered from civil war and entered into a period of very strong economic development, the conviction about its growing power – both political and military – was getting stronger. There were several exemplifications of this. Two of them were closely related to each other. The first one is return to the concept of American exceptionalism and the mission of civilizing other nations. At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century,

a set of ideas that had their roots in John Winthrop's City Upon the Hill speech, the concept of Manifest Destiny and others (see R. Kłosowicz, *Documents and Readings in American History. From the Colonies to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, Jagiellonian University Press, Kraków, 2005) that emphasized the unique nature of American society and institutions created in the United States appeared. At the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century new ideas that has one common conviction: the United States needs to carry out the policy of expansion outside the North American continent appeared. This strong conviction coincided with the situation in Cuba in the 1890s.

In 1895, another insurrection erupted on the Spanish colony. It was not the first time that the people of Cuba rose up and tried to gain independence. For Spain, the fact of the possession of Cuba, at that time, was of only symbolic meaning that allowed itself to be called a colonial power. As mentioned, this was not the first insurrection in Cuba. However, it was the first that gained the attention of both politicians of the United States and American citizens. However, this time the turmoil that was taking place in Cuba coincided with the popular expansionist ideas in the United States. As Cuba was perceived as a potential direction of US expansion for some time, this concept gained a lot of attention among American politicians in the second half of the last decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. There was a strong expansionist lobby in the United States that stated up huge propaganda to convince undecided politicians and citizens that it is the time to take over Cuba. The media, especially the newspapers of two media barons Hearst and Pulitzer, unleashed a wild campaign of propaganda, demanding a strong reaction of the US government in Cuba. Most importantly, the argument of atrocities that had been taking place in Cuba was raised. Nevertheless, in all this propaganda one could also easily find opinions that an American intervention in Cuba could be the first step toward greater expansion and the process of building a much stronger position of the United States in international relations. When on February 15, 1898 a huge explosion sunk the USS Maine in the port of Havana, all expansionists in the United States accused Spain of a brutal attack against the Union. President William McKinley found himself under strong pressure of all those who demanded a military response against Spain. Rhetoric used by American politicians during the Cuban crisis at the end of the 1890s was permeated by the reference to the concept of the American mission. Using military intervention in this case was an instrument of promoting such American values as independence and sovereignty. According to some Americans, chasing the Spaniards away from Cuba should be treated as a civilizing activity, especially for those who shared the concepts of Josiah Strong or John Fiske, which hoped that American intervention would be the first step to the Anglo-Saxon expansion. As the President was not a great enthusiast of American intervention, he found it difficult to reject this instrument after the explosion on the USS Maine, which resulted in over 250 American sailors being killed. Finally, on April 25 McKinley asked Congress to declare war, and it complied by passing a resolution which said that war had existed since April 21.

The war was a very important event in American foreign policy. Firstly, it diminished the last Spanish colonies in the Western Hemisphere. What is more important, it brought a huge change to the American foreign policy. Until the 1890s, the United States carried out a rather limited policy in the international forums. The Monroe Doctrine was a very significant determinant of US activity in the international system. Also, the economic

and military potentials made American foreign policy rather reserved. The United States became an economic power at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The war with Spain was a very firm announcement that the United States had also become a military power.

### William McKinley's War Message, April 11, 1898

Source: William McKinley War Message, April 11, 1898, in: Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS), Government Printing Office, Washington, 1901, p. 757

To the Congress of the United States:

Obedient to that precept of the Constitution which commands the President to give from time to time to the congress information of the state of Union and to recommend to their consideration such measures as be shall judge necessary and expedient, it becomes my duty now to address your body with regard to the grave crisis that has arisen in the relations of the United States to Spain by reason of the warfare that for more than three years has raged in the neighboring island of Cuba.

I do so because of the intimate connection of the Cuban question with the state of our own Union and the grave relation the course which it is now incumbent upon the nation to adopt must needs bear to the traditional policy of our Government if it is to accord with the precepts laid down by the founders of the Republic and religiously observed by succeeding Administrations to the present day.

The present revolution is but the successor of other similar insurrections which have occurred in Cuba against the dominion of Spain, extending over a period of nearly half a century, each of which, during its progress, has subjected the United States to great effort and expense in enforcing its neutrality laws, caused enormous losses to American trade and commerce caused irritation, annoyance, and disturbance among our citizens, and by the exercise of cruel, barbarous, and uncivilized practices of warfare, shocked the sensibilities and offended the humane sympathies of our people.

Since the present revolution began in February, 1895, this country has seen the fertile domain at our threshold ravaged by fire and sword in the course of a struggle unequalled in the history of the island and rarely paralleled as to the numbers of the combatants and the bitterness of the contest by any revolution of modern times where dependent people striving to be free have been opposed by the power of the sovereign state.

Our people have beheld a once prosperous community reduced to comparative want, its lucrative commerce virtually paralyzed, its exceptional productiveness diminished, its fields laid waste, its mills in ruins, and its people perishing by tens of thousands from hunger and destitution. We have found ourselves constrained, in the observance of that strict neutrality which our laws enjoin, and which the law of nations commands, to police our own waters and watch our own seaports in prevention of any unlawful act in aid of the Cubans.

Our trade has suffered; the capital invested by our citizens in Cuba has been largely lost, and the temper and forbearance of our people have been so sorely tried as to beget a perilous unrest among our own citizens which has inevitably found its expression from time to time in the National Legislature, so that issues wholly external to our own body politic engross attention and stand in the way of the close devotion to domestic advancement that becomes a self-contained commonwealth whose primal maxim has been the avoidance of all foreign entanglements. All this must need awaken, and has, indeed,

aroused the utmost concern on the part of this Government, as well during my predecessor's term as in my own.

(...)

The efforts of Spain were increased, both by the dispatch of fresh levies to Cuba and by the addition to the horrors of the strife of a new and inhuman phase happily unprecedented in the modern history of civilized Christian peoples. The policy of devastation and concentration, inaugurated by the Captain-General's bando of October 21, 1896, in the Province of Pinar del Rio was thence extended to embrace all of the island to which the power of the Spanish arms was able to reach by occupation or by military operations. The peasantry, including all dwelling in the open agricultural interior, were driven into the garrison towns or isolated places held by the troops.

The raising and movement of provisions of all kinds were interdicted. The fields were laid waste, dwellings unroofed and fired, mills destroyed, and, in short, everything that could desolate the land and render it unfit for human habitation or support was commanded by one or the other of the contending parties and executed by all the powers at their disposal.

By the time the present administration took office a year ago, reconcentration – so called – had been made effective over the better part of the four central and western provinces, Santa Clara, Matanzas, Havana, Pinar del Rio.

The agricultural population to the estimated number of 300,000 or more was herded within the towns and their immediate vicinage, deprived of the means of support, rendered destitute of shelter, left poorly clad, and exposed to the most unsanitary conditions. As the scarcity of food increased with the devastation of the depopulated areas of production, destitution and want became misery and starvation. Month by month the death rate increased in an alarming ratio. By March, 1897, according to conservative estimates from official Spanish sources, the mortality among the reconcentrados from starvation and the diseases thereto incident exceeded 50 per centum of their total number.

(...)

Meanwhile the military situation in the island had undergone a noticeable change. The extraordinary activity that characterized the second year of the war, when the insurgents invaded even the hitherto unharmed fields of Pinar del Rio and carried havoc and destruction up to the walls of the city of Havana itself, had relapsed into a dogged struggle in the central and eastern provinces. The Spanish arms regained a measure of control in Pinar del Rio and parts of Havana, but, under the existing conditions of the rural country, without immediate improvement of their productive situation. Even thus partially restricted, the revolutionists held their own, and their conquest and submission, put forward by Spain as the essential and sole basis of peace, seemed as far distant as at the outset.

In this state of affairs my Administration found itself confronted with the grave problem of its duty. My message of last December reviewed the situation and narrated the steps taken with a view to relieving its acuteness and opening the way to some form of honorable settlement. The assassination of the Prime Minister, Canovas, led to a change of government in Spain. The former administration, pledged to subjugation without concession, gave place to that of a more liberal party, committed long in advance to a policy of reform, involving the wider principle of home rule for Cuba and Puerto Rico.

(...)

The war in Cuba is of such a nature that short of subjugation or extermination a final military victory for either side seems impracticable. The alternative lies in the physical exhaustion of the one or the other party, or perhaps of both – a condition which in effect ended the ten year's war by the truce of Zanjón. The prospect of such a protraction and

conclusion of the present strife is a contingency hardly to be contemplated with equanimity by the civilized world, and least of all by the United States, affected and injured as we are, deeply and intimately, by its very existence.

Realizing this, it appeared to be my duty, in a spirit of true friendliness, no less to Spain than the Cubans who have so much to lose by the prolongation of the struggle, to seek to bring about on immediate termination of the war. To this end I submitted, on the 27<sup>th</sup> ultimo, as a result of much representation and correspondence, through the United States minister at Madrid, propositions to the Spanish Government looking to an armistice until October 1 for the negotiation of peace with the good offices of the President.

In addition, I asked the immediate revocation of the order of reconcentration, so as to permit the people to return to their farms and the needy to be relieved with provisions and supplies from the United States, cooperating with the Spanish authorities, so as to afford full relief.

The reply of the Spanish cabinet was received on the night of the 31<sup>st</sup> ultimo. It offered, as the means to bring about peace in Cuba, to confide the preparation thereof to the insular parliament, inasmuch as the concurrence of that body would be necessary to reach a final result, it being, however, understood that the powers reserved by the constitution to the central Government are not lessened or diminished. As the Cuban parliament does not meet until the 4<sup>th</sup> of May next, the Spanish Government would not object, for its part, to accept at once a suspension of hostilities if asked for by the insurgents from the general in chief, to whom it would pertain, in such case, to determine the duration and conditions of the armistice.

The propositions submitted by General Woodford and the reply of the Spanish Government were both in the form of brief memoranda, the texts of which are before me, and are substantially in the language above given. The function of the Cuban parliament in the matter of "preparing" peace and the manner of its doing so are not expressed in the Spanish memorandum; but from General Woodford's explanatory reports of preliminary discussions preceding the final conference it is understood that the Spanish Government stands ready to give the insular congress full powers to settle the terms of peace with the insurgents – whether by direct negotiation or indirectly by means of legislation does not appear.

With this last overture in the direction of immediate peace, and its disappointing reception by Spain, the Executive is brought to the end of his effort.

In my annual message of December last I said:

Of the untried measures there remained only: Recognition of the insurgents as belligerents; recognition of the independence of Cuba; neutral intervention to end the war by imposing a national a rational compromise between the contestants, and intervention in favor of one or the other party. I speak not of forcible annexation, for that can not be thought of. That, by our code of morality, would be criminal aggression.

(...)

It has thus made known to the world that the uniform policy and practice of the United States is to avoid all interference in disputes which merely relate to the internal government of other nations, and eventually to recognize the authority of the prevailing party without reference to our particular interests and views or to the merits of the original controversy. But on this, as on every other trying occasion, safety is to be found in a rigid adherence to principle.

In the contest between Spain and the revolted colonies we stood aloof, and waited not only until the ability of the new States to protect themselves was fully established, but until the danger of their being again subjugated had entirely passed away. Then, and not until then, were they recognized.

(...)

Nor from the standpoint of expediency do I think it would be wise or prudent for this Government to recognize at the present time the independence of the so-called Cuban Republic. Such recognition is not necessary in order to enable the United States to intervene and pacify the island. To commit this country now to the recognition of any particular government in Cuba might subject us to embarrassing conditions of international obligation toward the organization so recognized. In case of intervention our conduct would be subject to the approval or disapproval of such government. We would be required to submit to its direction and to assume to it the mere relation of a friendly ally.

When it shall appear hereafter that there is within the island a government capable of performing the duties and discharging the functions of a separate nation, and having, as a matter of fact, the proper forms and attributes of nationality, such government can be promptly and readily recognized and the relations and interests of the United States with such nation adjusted.

There remain the alternative forms of intervention to end the war, either as an impartial neutral by imposing a rational compromise between the contestants, or as the active ally of the one party or the other.

(...)

The forcible intervention of the United States as a neutral to stop the war, according to the large dictates of humanity and following many historical precedents where neighboring States have interfered to check the hopeless sacrifices of life by internecine conflicts beyond their borders, is justifiable on rational grounds. It involves, however, hostile constraint upon both the parties to the contest as well to enforce a truce as to guide the eventual settlement.

The grounds for such intervention may be briefly summarized as, follows:

First. In the cause of humanity and to put an end to the barbarities, bloodshed, starvation, and horrible miseries now existing there, and which the parties to the conflict are either unable or unwilling to stop or mitigate. It is no answer to say this is all in another country, belonging to another nation, and is therefore none of our business. It is specially our duty, for it is right at our door.

Second. We owe it to our citizens in Cuba to afford them that protection and indemnity for life and property which no government there can or will afford, and to that end to terminate the conditions that deprive them of legal protection.

Third. The right to intervene may be justified by the very serious injury to the commerce, trade, and business of our people, and by the wanton destruction of property and devastation of the island.

Fourth, and which is of the utmost importance. The present condition of affairs in Cuba is a constant menace to our peace, and entails upon this Government and enormous expense. With such a conflict waged for years in an island so near us and with which our people have such trade and business relations; when the lives and liberty of our citizens are in constant danger and their property destroyed and themselves ruined; where our trading vessels are liable to seizure and are seized at our very door by war ships of a foreign nation, the expeditions of filibustering that we are powerless to prevent altogether, and the irritating questions and entanglements thus arising – all these and others that I need not mention, with the resulting strained relations, are constant menace to our peace, and compel us to keep on a semiwar footing with a nation with which we are at peace.

These elements of danger and disorder already pointed out have been strikingly illustrated by a tragic event which has deeply and justly moved the American people. I have already transmitted to Congress the report of the naval court of inquiry on the destruc-

tion of the battle ship Maine in the harbor of Havana during the night of the 15<sup>th</sup> of February. The destruction of that noble vessel has filled the national heart with inexpressible horror. Two hundred and fifty-eight brave sailors and marines and two officers of our Navy, reposing in the fancied security of a friendly harbor, have been hurled to death, grief and want brought to their homes, and sorrow to the nation.

The naval court of inquiry, which it is needless to say, commands the unqualified confidence of the Government, was unanimous in its conclusion that the destruction of the Maine was caused by an exterior explosion, that of a submarine mine. It did not assume to place the responsibility. That remains to be fixed.

In any event the destruction of the Maine, by whatever exterior cause, is a patent and impressive proof of a state of things in Cuba that is intolerable. That condition is thus shown to be such that the Spanish Government can not assure safety and security to a vessel of the Americas Navy in the harbor of Havana on a mission of peace, and rightfully there.

Further referring in this connection to recent diplomatic correspondence, a dispatch from our minister to Spain, of the 36<sup>th</sup> ultimo, contained the statement that the Spanish minister for foreign affairs assured him positively that the Spain will do all that the highest honor and justice require in the matter of the Maine. The reply above referred to of the 31st ultimo also contained an expression of the readiness of Spain to submit to an arbitration all the differences which can arise in this matter, which is subsequently explained by the note of the Spanish minister at Washington of the 10<sup>th</sup> instant, as follows: As to the question of fact which springs from the diversity of views between the reports of the American and Spanish boards, Spain proposes that the facts be ascertained by an impartial investigation by experts, whose decision Spain accepts in advance.

To this I have made no reply.

(...)

In this view in the earlier days of the contest the good offices of the United States as a mediator were tendered in good faith, without any selfish purpose, in the interest of humanity and in sincere friendship for both parties, but were at the time declined by Spain, with the declaration, nevertheless, that at a future time they would be indispensable. No intimation has been received that in the opinion of Spain that time has been reached. And yet the strife continues with all its dread horrors and all its injuries to the interests of the United States and of other nations.

(...)

In my annual message to Congress, December last, speaking to this question, I said: The near future will demonstrate whether the indispensable condition of a righteous peace, just alike to the Cubans and to Spain, as well as equitable to all our interests so intimately involved in the welfare of Cuba, is likely to be attained. If not, the exigency of further and other action by the United States will remain to be taken. When the time comes that action will be determined in the line of indisputable right and duty. It will be faced, without misgiving or hesitancy, in the light of the obligation this Government owes to itself, to the people who have confided to it the protection of their interests and honor, and to humanity.

Sure of the right, keeping free from all offense ourselves, actuated only by upright and patriotic considerations, moved neither by passion nor selfishness, the Government will continue its watchful care over the rights and property of American citizens and will abate none of its efforts to bring about by peaceful agencies a peace which shall be honorable and enduring. If it shall hereafter appear to be a duty imposed by our obligations to ourselves, to civilization and humanity to intervene with force, it shall be without fault on our part only because the necessity for such action will be so clear as to command the support and approval of the civilized world.

The long trail has proved that the object for which Spain has waged the war can not be attained. The fire of insurrection may flame or may smolder with varying seasons, but it has not been and it is plain that it can not be extinguished by present methods. The only hope of relief and repose from a condition which can no longer be endured is the enforced pacification of Cuba. In the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests which gives us the right and the duty to speak and to act, the war in Cuba must stop.

In view of these facts and of these considerations, I ask the Congress to authorize and empower the President to take measure to secure a full and final termination of hostilities between the Government of Spain and the people of Cuba, and to secure in the island the establishment of a stable government, capable of maintaining order and observing its international obligations, insuring peace and tranquility and the security of its citizens as well as our own, and to use the military and naval forces of the United States as may be necessary for these purposes.

And in the interest of humanity and to aid in preserving the lives of the starving people of the island I recommend that the distribution of food and supplies be continued, and that an appropriation be made out of the public Treasury to supplement the charity of our citizens.

The issue is now with the Congress. It is a solemn responsibility. I have exhausted every effort to relieve the intolerable condition of affairs which is at our doors. Prepared to execute every obligation imposed upon me by the Constitution and the law, I await your action.

Yesterday, and since the preparation of the foregoing message, official information was received by me that the latest decree of the Queen Regent of Spain directs General Blanco, in order to prepare and facilitate peace, to proclaim a suspension of hostilities, the duration and details of which have not yet been communicated to me.

This fact with every other pertinent consideration will, I am sure, have your just and careful attention in the solemn deliberations upon which you are about to enter. If this measure attains a successful result, then our aspirations as a Christian, peace-loving people will be realized. If it fails, it will be only another justification for our contemplated action.

William McKinley

Executive Mansion, April 11, 1898

## The Teller Amendment, April 20, 1898

Along with the growing popularity of the expansionist concept in the United States, an opposite tendency could also be observed. All those who were strictly connected to the tradition of American foreign policy did not want Cuba's inclusion in the Union. As they declared that the war with Spain could prove necessary due to the atrocities taking place on the island, they strongly opposed any ideas of American expansion. The absence of any reference to Cuban independence in McKinley's message to Congress disturbed



some legislators who had been assured that the administration demanded it from Spain. The domination of pro-war congressmen in the American Congress resulted in the adoption of a Joint Resolution for the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba. Its initiator was Senator Henry M. Teller (Colorado). The Resolution stated that Cubans have the right to be free and independent. As the aim of the Resolution was to give independence to the citizens of Cuba, the United States disclaimed any intention to exercise sovereignty or control over the Cuban Island.

### The Teller Amendment, April 20, 1898

Source: <http://www.historyofcuba.com/history/teller.htm> (14.02.2013)

The following resolutions were passed without opposition by both houses of Congress on April 20, 1898. The fourth is the one referred to as The Teller Amendment, and is named after its author, Henry M. Teller, Senator of Colorado.

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the Island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating, as they have, in the destruction of a United States battle ship, with two hundred and sixty-six of its officers and crew, while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Havana, and can not longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April eleventh, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, upon which the action of Congress was invited:

Therefore, Resolved,

First. That the people of the Island of Cuba are, of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the Island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said Island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the Island to its people.

## The Platt Amendment, March 2, 1902

The Spanish-American war ended in December 1898. The Peace Treaty was signed in Paris. It is worth mentioning, that Cuban independence forces did not participate in the peace negotiations. In effect of the war, Spain lost its last colonies in the Western Hemisphere: Puerto Rico and Cuba. Both were occupied by the US military. The Philippines also became a US protectorate. As the Teller amendment did not permit Cuba's inclusion to the United States, American expansionists were looking for any possibility to take control over the island. In 1903, Senator Orville Platt proposed a set of rules that would constitute the foundation of Cuban-American relations. However, the actual initiator was then Secretary of War Elihu Root. The aim of the amendment was to restrict Cuban independence as far as it was possible. That would permit the island to be controlled without its formal inclusion to the Union which was forbidden by the Teller amendment. The adoption of Platt's proposition meant that if the Cuban authorities wanted to end the American military occupation of the island, they would have to accept the rules included in Platt's Amendment. The Amendment to the Army Appropriation Bill of March 2, 1901, as was the official name of the Platt's Amendment, made Cuba a US protectorate. In June 1902, the amendment was included into the Cuban constitution by a margin of one vote. The Platt Amendment was formally delayed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in May 29, 1934.

### The Platt Amendment, March 2, 1902

Source: <http://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=55&page=transcript> (19.09.2013)

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America, by an Act approved March 2, 1901, provided as follows:

Provided further, that in fulfillment of the declaration contained in the joint resolution approved April twentieth, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, entitled "For the recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba, demanding that the Government of Spain relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba, and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters, and directing the President of the United States to use the land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect," the President is hereby authorized to "leave the government and control of the island of Cuba to its people" so soon as a government shall have been established in said island under a constitution which, either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto, shall define the future relations of the United States with Cuba, substantially as follows:

"I. That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes or otherwise, lodgement in or control over any portion of said island."

"II. That said government shall not assume or contract any public debt, to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government shall be inadequate."

"III. That the government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the government of Cuba."

"IV. That all Acts of the United States in Cuba during its military occupancy thereof are ratified and validated, and all lawful rights acquired thereunder shall be maintained and protected."

"V. That the government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein."

"VI. That the Isle of Pines shall be omitted from the proposed constitutional boundaries of Cuba, the title thereto being left to future adjustment by treaty."

"VII. That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the government of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points to be agreed upon with the President of the United States."

"VIII. That by way of further assurance the government of Cuba will embody the foregoing provisions in a permanent treaty with the United States."

## Fidel Castro's Address before the U.N. General Assembly, September 26, 1960

Fidel Castro led the Cuban Revolution to victory at the very beginning of 1959. It was a revolution in which leaders wanted to break with Cuba's total dependency on the United States. It was the first revolution in the Latin American and Caribbean region that achieved its goals. As the US government lost a firm ally in the form of the Fulgencio Batista regime, the new revolutionary government was perceived by American authorities as a significant danger for US interests in the island from the very beginning. First, it was an economic danger, as the new Cuban leaders implemented a broad spectrum of reforms that hit the interests of American entrepreneurs. Second, it constituted a real political danger as it declared to carry out a fully independent foreign policy. In the reality of the Cold War that kind of declaration was very risky for the new government. However, Fidel Castro and others *barbudos*, as the revolutionary leaders were called, believed

that this objective was very possible to achieve. At the beginning of the revolutionary government they desired a real independence and sovereignty. Breaking off from the United States did not mean a natural alliance with the other superpower – the Soviet Union for them. It took some time for the Cuban revolutionaries to understand that only two options are available in a bipolar international system: an alliance with either one or the other superpower and with no space left for a truly independent foreign policy.

From the very beginning, US diplomacy did not understand the very nature of the Cuban revolution. Perceiving it only from the perspective of a bipolar international system, it made a lot of mistakes. The first one was putting the revolution in the frame of the leftist or even the communist movement that resulted in treating revolutionaries as enemies and a danger for US policy in the region. In its attitude toward the Cuban revolution, the United States decided on the policy of pressure and to implement it, Americans used different economic, political, and military instruments. From the beginning, the United States' attitude toward revolutionary government was hostile. Undoubtedly, there were a lot of misunderstandings in the American interpretation of the Cuban revolution, its nature and goals. This resulted in great hostility between both countries.

Fidel Castro as a leader – first a revolutionary guerilla and after a victorious military campaign of a revolutionary government – was not a natural born communist. His political profile evolved. After the victory of the revolution his program quickly developed in the direction of communism and an alliance with the Soviet Union. The question about the causes of that evolution still remains. There are a lot of opinions that this evolution was the result of the firm hostility of the US government. Others say that in the Cold War reality he did not have any other option. Regardless, it is very interesting to observe this evolution of Castro's ideas.

In September 1960, the meeting of United Nation's General Assembly was held in New York City. Fidel Castro decided to use this occasion to explain the nature of the Cuban revolution to the political leaders from all over the world. Also, he used it to make his first very sharp attack on the United States. It was not his first trip to the United States as a leader of the Cuban revolutionary government. His first visit took place in the spring of 1959. However, during both trips he was treated disrespectfully by the US authorities. During the first visit, President Dwight Eisenhower did not find any free time to meet with Castro. Meanwhile during the second visit, in September 1960, the Cuban delegation was forced to leave its hotel and look for another one. Finally, during his address to the U.N. General Assembly, Fidel Castro firmly attacked the United States. Not only for the treatment of the Cuban delegation during its visit to New York City summit but predominantly for its imperialist and colonial foreign policy. He accused the American government of its hostile policy toward the Cuban revolutionary government. Castro emphasized that Cuba is not the only country in which the US government carries out its imperialist foreign policy. He mentioned the examples of Congo and Algeria, among others as extraordinary evidence of American imperialism. In his speech Castro also explained the very nature of the Cuban revolution. He described it as a natural response of the Cuban people to the long history of American exploitation of the island. The revolution was – according to Fidel Castro – a firm desire of the Cuban people to live in dignity and prosperity.

Fidel Castro's speech during the U.N. General Assembly on September 26, 1960 is one of his most significant speeches. It was one of the first such strong attacks on the United States made on an international forum. During that speech, Castro presented strong anti-American and anti-imperialist foundations of Cuban foreign policy after the victorious revolution.

## Fidel Castro, Address at the U.N. General Assembly, September 26, 1960

Source: *The Dynamics of World Power. A Documentary History of World Policy, 1945–1973*, ed. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., vol. 3 Latin America, Chelsea House Publishers, New York, 1973, pp. 463–499

<http://www.marxists.org/history/cuba/archive/castro/1960/09/26.htm> (21.01.2014)

The speakers who have preceded me on this rostrum have expressed their concern about problems the whole world is concerned about. We too are concerned about those problems and yet, in the case of Cuba, there is a very special circumstance, and it is that, at this moment, Cuba itself must be a concern for the world, because, as several delegates have rightly said here, among the many current problems of the world, there is the problem of Cuba. In addition to the problems facing the world today, Cuba has problems of her own, problems which worry her people.

(...)

As I have said, we had to undergo degrading and humiliating treatment, including eviction from the hotel in which we were living and efforts at extortion. When we went to another hotel, we did all in our power to avoid difficulties. We refrained from leaving our hotel rooms and went nowhere except to this assembly hall of the United Nations, on the few occasions when we have come to General Assembly. We also accepted an invitation to a reception at the Soviet Embassy, yet this was not enough for them to leave us in peace.

(...)

When we were forced to leave one of the hotels in this city, and came to the United National Headquarters while efforts were being made to find accommodation for us, a hotel, a humble hotel of this city, a Negro hotel in Harlem, offered to rent us rooms. The reply came when we were speaking to the Secretary General. Nevertheless, an official of the State Department did all in his power to prevent our staying at that hotel. At that moment, as though by magic, hotels began appearing all over New York. Hotels which had previously refused lodgings to the Cuban delegation offered us rooms, even free of charge. Out of simple reciprocity we accepted the Harlem hotel. We felt then that we had earned the right to be left in peace. But peace was not accorded us.

Once in Harlem, since it was impossible to prevent us from living there, the slander and defamation campaigns began. They began spreading the news all over the world that the Cuban delegation had lodged in a brothel. For some humble hotel in Harlem, a hotel inhabited by Negroes of the United States, must obviously be a brothel. Furthermore, they have tried to heap infamy upon the Cuban delegation, without even respecting the female members who work with us and are a part of the Cuban delegation.

(...)

The problem of Cuba. Perhaps some of you may be well aware of the facts; others not so well – it all depends on the sources of information – but, as far as the world is concerned the problem of Cuba has come to a head, it has appeared in the last two years, and as such it is a new problem. The world had not had many reasons to know that Cuba existed. For many it was an offshoot of the United States. And this is the case for many citizens of this very country – Cuba was virtually a colony of the United States. As far as the map was concerned, the map said something different. Cuba was colored differently from the color that was used for the United States; but in reality Cuba was a colony of the United States.

(...)

Therefore, the Cuban people, squandering life, rose up and threw that government out. And, when the revolution was successful in Cuba, what did it uncover? What did it find? What marvels lay spread out the eyes of the victorious revolutionaries of Cuba? First of all, the revolution found that 600 000 Cubans, able and ready to work, were unemployed – as many, proportionally, as were unemployed in the United States at the time of the great depression which shook this country, and which almost produced a catastrophe in the United States. This is what we met with – permanent unemployment in my country. Three million out of a population of somewhat over six million had no electric light and none of the advantages and comforts of electricity. Three and a half million out of a total population of more than six million lived in huts, in slums, without the slightest sanitary facilities. In the cities, rents took almost one-third of family incomes. Electricity rates and rents were among the highest in the world.

Thirty-seven and one-half per cent of our population were illiterate; 70 per cent of the rural children lacked teachers; 2 per cent of our population suffered from tuberculosis, that is to say, one hundred thousand persons, out of a total population of a little over six million, were suffering from the ravages of tuberculosis. Ninety-five per cent of the children in rural areas were suffering from parasites. Infant mortality was astronomical. The standard of living was the opposite. On the other hand, 85 per cent of the small farmers were paying rent on their land to the extent of almost 30 per cent of their gross income, whilst 1–1/2 per cent of the total landowners controlled 46 per cent of the total area of the country. Of course, the proportion of hospital beds to the number of inhabitants of the country was ludicrous when compared with countries that have even half-way decent medical services. Public services, electricity and telephone services, all belonged to United States monopolies. A major portion of the banking business, of importing business and the oil refineries, a greater part of the sugar production, the lion's share of the arable land of Cuba and the most important industries in all fields in Cuba belonged to North American companies.

The balance of payments in the last ten years, from 1950 to 1960, has been favorable for the United States vis-a-vis Cuba to the extent of one billion dollars. This is without taking into account the hundreds of millions of dollars that were extracted from the treasury of the country by the corrupt officials of the tyranny and were later deposited in United States or European banks. One billion dollars in ten years! The poor and underdeveloped country in the Caribbean, with 600,000 unemployed, was contributing to the economic development of the most highly industrialized country in the world!

This was the situation that confronted us. Yet it should not surprise many of the countries represented in this Assembly, because, when all is said and done, what we have said about Cuba is, one may say, an X-ray that could be superimposed and applied to many of the countries here represented in the Assembly.

What alternative was there for the revolutionary Government? To betray the people? As far as the President of the United States is concerned, what we have done is treason to our people, but it surely would not have been so if, instead of the revolutionary Government being true to its people, it had rather been true to the monopolies that were exploiting Cuba.

(...)

Thus far we have referred to the problems of our country. Why haven't those problems been solved? Is it because we did not want them solved? Hardly. The Government of Cuba has always been ready to discuss its problems with the Government of the United States, but the Government of the United States has not been ready to discuss the Cuban problems with Cuba. It must have its reasons for not wanting to discuss these problems with Cuba.

(...)

First of all, the Government of the United States considers it has the right to promote and encourage subversion in our country. The Government of the United States of America is promoting the organization of subversive movements against the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, and we here denounce it in the General Assembly. Concretely we wish to denounce, for example, that in a Caribbean Island, a territory which belongs to Honduras and which is known as the Swan Islands, the Government of the United States has taken over this Island in a military manner.

There are now North American infantrymen there, despite the fact that this is Honduran territory. And there, in violation of international law, despoiling a neighbor country of its territory, in violation of the international conventions which govern radio broadcasting, it has set up a powerful transmitter, which it has put at the disposal of war criminals and of the subversive groups which are sheltered in this country. And there, in addition, military training is being given to promote subversion and to promote the landing of armed forces on our Island.

It might be good for the representative of Honduras to the United Nations General Assembly to stress Honduras' right to that part of its territory. But that is a matter incumbent upon the representative of Honduras. What does concern us is that a piece of territory belonging to a neighbor country, taken away in a filibustering fashion by the Government of the United States, should be used as a base for subversion and for attacks against our territory.

I want careful note taken of this denunciation that we make on behalf of the Government of the people of Cuba. Does the Government of the United States feel that it has the right to promote and encourage subversion in my country, violating all international treaties, violating the radio frequencies of my country, with great harm to our own radio stations? Does this mean that the Cuban Government, then, has the right also to promote subversion in the United States of America; that we have the right to violate the air and radio frequencies of the United States of America? What right can the Government of the United States have over us or over our Island that it permits itself the right to demand the same respect from other peoples? Let the United States return the Swan Islands to Honduras, because it never had jurisdiction over such Islands.

(...)

The problems which we have been describing in relation to Cuba apply perfectly well to all of Latin America. The control of Latin American economic resources is exercised by the monopolies which, when they do not directly own the mines and take charge of the working of them, as in the case of copper in Chile, Peru and Mexico and in the case of zinc in Peru and Mexico, as well as in the case of oil in Venezuela, they are the owners of the public- service companies, which is the case with the electric services in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Ecuador and Colombia, or of the telephonic services, which is the case in Chile, Brazil, Peru, Venezuela, Paraguay and Bolivia. Or, they exploit commercially our products, as is the case with coffee in Brazil, Colombia, El Salvador, Costa Rica and Guatemala, or with the exploitation, marketing and transportation of bananas by the United Fruit Company in Guatemala, Costa Rica and Honduras, or with cotton in Mexico and Brazil. That economic control is exercised by North American monopolies of the most

important industries of the country, industries which are dependent completely on the monopolies.

(...)

The problem of Cuba is only an example of what Latin America is. How long must Latin America wait for its development? According to the point of view of the monopolists it will have to wait *ad calendas Graecas*. Who is going to industrialize Latin America? The monopolists? Certainly not.

There is a report of the United Nations on economic matters which explains how even private capital, instead of going to the countries that need it most, for the setting up of basic industries in order to contribute to the development of those countries are preferably being channeled to the more industrialized countries because there, according to their findings, private capital finds greater security. Naturally the economic secretariat of the United Nations has had to recognize the fact that there is no possible chance of development through investment of private capital – that is, through the monopolies.

(...)

The problems of Latin America are like the problems of the rest of the world: Africa and Asia. The world is divided up among the monopolies; those same monopolies that we see in Latin America are also seen in the Middle East. There the oil is in the hands of monopolistic companies that are controlled by the financial interests of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, France, in Iran, in Iraq, in Saudi Arabia, in Kuwait, in Qatar and, finally, in all corners of the world. The same thing happens, for example, in the Philippines. The same thing happens in Africa.

The world has been divided among the monopolistic interests. Who would dare deny this historic truth? The monopolistic interests do not want to see the development of peoples. What they want is to exploit the natural resources of the countries and to exploit the people in the bargain, and the sooner they amortize their investments or get them back, the better it is for them.

The problem that the Cuban people have suffered from the imperialist Government of the United States are the same problems that Saudi Arabia would have if it decided to nationalize its oil fields, or if Iran or Iraq decided to do so; the same problems that Egypt had when it quite justifiably and correctly nationalized the Suez Canal; the very same problems that Indonesia had when it wanted to become independent; the same surprise attack that was made against Egypt and on the Congo.

(...)

We want to raise another right here, a right that was proclaimed by our people at an enormous public manifestation a few days ago. I refer to the right of the under-developed countries to nationalize without indemnity, the natural resources of and the monopolistic investments in their countries. In other words, we proclaim the nationalization of the natural resources of any foreign investments in the under-developed countries. And if the highly industrialized countries wish to do likewise, we shall not oppose them.

For countries to be truly free politically, they must be truly free economically. They must be assisted. We may be asked: What about the value of the investments? And we shall then ask: what about the value of the profits that have been derived from the colonies and the under-developed countries for decades, if not centuries?

(...)

The Soviet delegation spoke in clear terms – and I am speaking objectively here – I invite you gentlemen to study those proposals, I invite you gentlemen to place all your cards on the table. Above all, this is not only a question of delegations now; this is a question of world public opinion. The warmongers and the military-minded must be unveiled before the opinion of the world. This is not a problem for the minority. This is a problem for the world itself. And we must strip the masks from those warmongers, those militarists.



That is the task for world public opinion. Not only must this be discussed in the plenary of the General Assembly, but it must be discussed before the eyes of all humanity, before the great assembly of the world itself, because in the case of a war it will not be the responsible ones alone who will be exterminated; it will be hundreds of millions of innocent ones who are not the least to blame who will be exterminated.

(...)

Now, what are the difficulties of disarmament? Who is interested in being armed? Those who are interested in being armed to the teeth are those who wish to hold on to their colonies, those who want to hold on to their monopolies, those who want to hold on to the oil of the Middle East, the natural resources of the Middle East and of Asia and of Africa and who, in order to defend these interests need force and might. And, you know full well that it was because of the right of might that these territories were occupied and colonized; that because of this right of might, millions of men were made slaves. It is might and force that keep this exploitation going in the world. Therefore, the first who do not want disarmament are those who wish to maintain this right of might, those who wish to keep their hands on the wealth of countries and on the cheap labor of under-developed countries.

I said I was going to speak clearly, and I could not refer to truth or voice truth in any other words. The colonialists, then, are those who are opposed to disarmament. Then we will have to fight, with world opinion on our side, to impose disarmament on them, as we will have to fight to impose on them the rights of all peoples to political and economic self-determination. The monopolies are against disarmament because, besides the fact that with arms they can defend their interests, the arms race has always been good business for the monopolies. For example, everybody knows that the great monopolies in this country doubled their capital during the Second World War. Like vultures, the monopolies feed on the dead of the wars – and war is good business. Let us then strip the masks from those who do business with war, those who enrich themselves by war. Let us open the eyes of the world and show them who are those warmongers who play and trade with the fate of humanity, those who trade on the dangers of war, especially when war can be so terrifying as to leave no hope of escape nor of salvation for anybody.



## Chapter Three

# Inter-oceanic Canal in Central America

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century the United States went through a process of great evolution. From the country based on 13 former British colonies, it evolved into the one of the most important actors of international relations at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century. It enlarged its territory to the Pacific Coast. The second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was also the time of unprecedented economic development. In effect, the United States became a powerful state that demanded different forms of escalating its influence not only in the region of the Western Hemisphere but also in the world. Also, it desperately needed new possibilities of communication between the east and the west coast. The situation was also changing in the area of international relations. A rapid economic development in the last three decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century resulted in growing economic competition with Great Britain, especially in the Western Hemisphere. To challenge the dominance of Great Britain in the area of international relations, the United States had to increase its capabilities in the sphere of transoceanic transport. It was also necessary in order to maintain economic development. The United States had to gain new markets for their products.

This is how the idea of the inter-oceanic canal construction was born. Due to international competition and limited possibilities, the United States had to cooperate, at the beginning, with another important actor in the region of Central America, namely Great Britain. However, the changing realities of the international situation at the turn of the centuries pushed American diplomacy to more firm actions. The first goal was to reach independence from Great Britain in the case of the canal building. Then came the difficult debates over the location of the canal and finally negotiations with the proper governments and authorities to get formal permission for the construction of the canal. To do this, the United States decided to support the independence of Panama which had been a part of Colombia. In the effect, Panama was the second Latin American country – after Cuba – which gained independence with the direct involvement of the United States. The construction of the canal and its legal status resulted in the United States being strongly engaged in the internal affairs of Panama in the following decades. As the Panama Canal and the canal Zone were under the US control, it was a perfect instrument of interference in the internal affairs of Panama. This is why Omar Torrijos, who gained power in Panama at 1968, decided to negotiate the status of the Panama Canal Zone with the United States. After several years of extremely difficult negotiations he achieved his

goal and signed new treaties with American President Jimmy Carter. In effect, Panama took over the control over the Canal Zone in 2000.

The canal affair had a big influence on US Latin American policy. First, at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, when it was related to the competition with European countries interested in building canal, mainly Great Britain, and then, after the opening of the Canal, the entire Central American isthmus. This was particularly visible during the Cold War, when the United States was always aware of its control over the Canal Zone.

## The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, April 19, 1850

The communication problem in the Western Hemisphere resulting from territorial expansion resulted in the United States' growing interference in Latin American affairs since the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. There were discussions in the colonial past about the difficulties in the transportation of goods from the Atlantic ports in the eastern coast of America to the western ones and vice versa. As the New World was the meeting point of commerce with Europe and the Far East, the case of transportation was very important. For the United States, the case started to be extremely important after the war with Mexico in 1848 and reaching the Pacific coast. The journey from one coast to the other took a long time and was quite dangerous. Hence, the Americans were firmly interested in the possibilities of creating new, more useful way of communication between their both coasts. Among others, President Polk underlined the significance of the canal in Central America for US interests.

In the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, Great Britain remained the most important European power in the Latin American region, especially in Central America. Also, it was still the most important naval superpower that was interested in any possibilities of creating a new naval route in the Central American isthmus. In spring of 1850, British ambassador in the United States, Henry L. Bulwer negotiated the conditions of cooperation between the two countries in the event of building an inter-oceanic canal in Central America with the American Department of State. The result was the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty – signed in April of 1850, and ratified by the US Congress a month later. According to the Treaty, Great Britain and the United States obliged each other to cooperation and consultation in the event of building the canal. The treaty also stated that neither of the sides would have exclusive control over the canal.

The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty was a big success for American diplomacy. For the first time, a European superpower was obliged to consult its actions in Central America. The United States ensured itself the same right to build the canal as Great Britain. However, there were a broad group of American politicians that criticized the treaty as a betrayal of the Monroe Doctrine as it accepted British presence in Central America.

## The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, April 19, 1850

Source: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th\\_century/br1850.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/br1850.asp) (23.09.2013)

The United States of America and her Britannic Majesty, being desirous of consolidating the relations of amity which so happily subsist between them, by setting forth and fixing in a convention their views and intentions with reference to any means of communication by ship canal, which may be constructed between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, by the way of the River San Juan de Nicaragua, and either or both of the lakes of Nicaragua or Managua, to any port or place on the Pacific Ocean: the President of the United States has conferred full powers on John M. Clayton, Secretary of State of the United States; and her Britannic Majesty on the Right Honorable Sir Henry Lytton Bulwer, a member of her Majesty's Most Honorable Privy Council, Knight Commander of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of her Britannic Majesty to the United States, for the aforesaid purpose; and the said plenipotentiaries, having exchanged their full powers, which were found to be in proper form, have agreed to the following articles:

### ARTICLE I

The governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare, that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship canal; agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America; nor will either make use of any protection which either affords or may afford, or any alliance which either has or may have, to or with any State or people, for the purpose of erecting or maintaining any such fortifications, or of occupying, fortifying, or colonizing Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito coast, or any part of Central America, or of assuming or exercising dominion over the same; nor will the United States or Great Britain take advantage of any intimacy, or use any alliance, connection, or influence that either may possess, with any State or government through whose territory the said canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one, any rights or advantages in regard to commerce or navigation through the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the citizens or subjects of the other.

### ARTICLE II

Vessels of the United States or Great Britain traversing the said canal shall, in case of war between the contracting parties, be exempted from blockade, detention, or capture by either of the belligerents; and this provision shall extend to such a distance from the two ends of the said canal as may hereafter be found expedient to establish.

(...)

### ARTICLE V

The contracting parties further engage that, when the said canal shall have been completed, they will protect it from interruption, seizure, or unjust confiscation, and that they will guarantee the neutrality thereof, so that the said canal may forever be open and free, and the capital invested therein secure. Nevertheless, the governments of the United States and Great Britain, in according their protection to the construction of the said canal, and guaranteeing its neutrality and security when completed, always understand that this protection and guarantee are granted conditionally, and may be withdrawn by both governments, or either government, if both governments, or either gov-

ernment should deem that the persons or company undertaking or managing the same adopt or establish such regulations concerning the traffic thereupon as are contrary to the spirit and intention of this convention, either by making unfair discriminations in favor of the commerce of one of the contracting parties over the commerce of the other, or by imposing oppressive exactions or unreasonable tolls upon passengers, vessels, goods, wares, merchandise, or other articles. Neither party, however, shall withdraw the aforesaid protection and guarantee, without first giving six months notice to the other.

(...)

Done at Washington, the nineteenth day of April, anno Domini one thousand eight hundred and fifty.

JOHN M. CLAYTON [L.S.]

HENRY LYTTON BULWER [L.S.]

## The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, November 18, 1901

After the victorious war with Spain in 1898 the expansionist attitudes in US foreign policy gained momentum. The conviction that the United States became a real power in international relations resulted in the growing criticism of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. As it tied the US actions in the matters of the inter-oceanic canal in Central America with Great Britain, it was perceived by a growing number of American politicians as a significant obstacle in the case of building the canal. Meanwhile, in the United States pressure related to the canal was very strong. As a result of the economic boom, the possibility of the easy and quick route from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast was very important. It was a matter of national security as well. The war with Spain showed that the US Naval Force very much needs the possibility of fast transfer from one ocean to the other. The only possibility of carrying this out was the canal in the Central American isthmus. This is why already in 1900 US diplomacy was looking forward to the possibility of reformulating the statements of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. The fact of French efforts to build the canal under the concession that *Compagnie Nouvelle du Canal de Panama* obtained in the years 1878–1888 was not without meaning. The British engagement in Africa and the growing political disturbances in Europe also acted in favor of the American interests. In this situation, American Secretary of State, John Hay decided to negotiate with British ambassador in Washington, Julien Pauncefote. First treaty was signed at the beginning of 1900. Meanwhile, in November 18, 1901 both sides signed the next treaty. It significantly modified the previous arrangements. The most important one was the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty. In effect of the agreement signed by Hay and Pauncefote, the United States obtained sovereignty in the case of building the canal and no longer had to consult its construction with Great Britain. Additionally, the case of building military installations in the Canal Zone was not mentioned in the treaty. It was interpreted by the US diplomacy as informal approval for American fortifications in the Canal Zone.

## The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, November 18, 1901

Source: <http://america.library4history.org/VFW-Automobile-Wilson/NEW-WORLD-POWER/HAY-PAUNCEFOTE-TREATY.html> (23.09.2013)

The United States of America and His Majesty Edward the Seventh, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King and Emperor of India, being desirous to facilitate the construction of a ship canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, by whatever route may be considered expedient, and to that end to remove any objection which may arise out of the Convention of the 19<sup>th</sup> April, 1850, commonly called the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, to the construction of such canal under the auspices of the Government of the United States.

### ARTICLE I

The High Contracting Parties agree that the present Treaty shall supersede the aforementioned Convention of the 19<sup>th</sup> April, 1850.

### ARTICLE II

It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States, either directly at its own cost, or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations, or through subscription to or purchase of stock or shares, and that, subject to the provision of the present Treaty, the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right incident to such construction, as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.

### ARTICLE III

The United States adopts, as the basis of the neutralization of such ship canal, the following Rules, substantially as embodied in the Convention of Constantinople, signed the 28<sup>th</sup> October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez Canal, that is to say:

1. The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these Rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

2. The canal shall never be blockaded, nor shall any right of war be exercised nor any act of hostility be committed within it. The United States, however, shall be at liberty to maintain such military police along the canal as may be necessary to protect it against lawlessness and disorder.

3. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not revictual nor take any stores in the canal except so far as may be strictly necessary; and the transit of such vessels through the canal shall be effected with the least possible delay in accordance with the regulations in force, and with only such intermission as may result from the necessities of the service.

Prizes shall be in all respects subject to the same rules as vessels of war of the belligerents.

4. No belligerent shall embark or disembark troops, munitions of war, or warlike materials in the canal, except in case of accidental hindrance of the transit, and in such case the transit shall be resumed with all possible dispatch.

5. The provisions of the Article shall apply to waters adjacent to the canal, within 3 marine miles of either end. Vessels of war of a belligerent shall not remain in such waters longer than twenty-four hours at any one time, except in case of distress, and in such case, shall depart as soon as possible; but a vessel of war of one belligerent shall not depart within twenty-four hours from a vessel of war of the other belligerent.

6. The plant, establishments, buildings, and all work necessary to the construction, maintenance, and operation of the canal shall be deemed to be part thereof, for the purposes of this Treaty, and in time of war, as in time of peace, shall enjoy complete immunity from attack or injury by belligerents, and from acts calculated to impair their usefulness as part of the canal.

#### ARTICLE IV

It is agreed that no change of territorial sovereignty or of the international relations of the country or countries traversed by the before-mentioned canal shall affect the general principle of neutralization or the obligation of the High Contracting Parties under the present Treaty.

(...)

## The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty, November 18, 1903

After the assassination of President William McKinley, it was Theodore Roosevelt who assumed the presidency in the United States. He was a great supporter of the idea of an inter-oceanic canal that would significantly improve the geopolitical position of the United States. This is why he personally insisted on the finalization of all diplomatic efforts and starting construction.

However, there was no consensus in the US about the localization of the canal. One option was Nicaragua and the San Juan River. The other was the adaptation of the constructions carried out in Panama by Ferdinand de Lesseps' *Compagnie Nouvelle du Canal de Panama*. The great lobby action in favor of the Panamanian route was undertaken by Phillipe Bunau-Varilla who bought the concession from Ferdinand de Lesseps. When the US Congress finally decided on the construction of the canal in Panama, it was necessary to get permission of the Colombian government as Panama was a Colombian province. US diplomacy decided to take advantage of the turmoil that took place in Colombia at that time and presented of the proposal of an agreement that would permit the construction of the canal to the Colombian ambassador in Washington. As it had the form of ultimatum, the ambassador decided to sign it. The American Congress ratified the agreement rapidly, although it was rejected by the Colombian parliament. Theodore Roosevelt decided to use all instruments to finalize the matter of the canal. In this situation, American diplomacy used the Panamanian independence movement to carry out their own goals. It had firm assistance as Bunau-Varilla acted intensely in favor of US interests. In effect, Panama announced its independence on November 4, 1903. An American war ship blocked any Colombian military intervention. Two



weeks later, on November 18, American Secretary of State John Hay and Bunau-Varilla signed an agreement that permitted the United States to construct the canal. It gave them exclusivity in the construction process and total control of the canal and the Canal Zone along with 5 miles on each of its banks. The United States also became the guarantor of the Panamanian independence.

## Convention for the Construction of a Ship Canal (Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty), November 18, 1903

Source: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/pan001.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/pan001.asp) (23.09.2013)

The United States of America and the Republic of Panama being desirous to insure the construction of a ship canal across the Isthmus of Panama to connect the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and the Congress of the United States of America having passed an act approved June 28, 1902, in furtherance of that object, by which the President of the United States is authorized to acquire within a reasonable time the control of the necessary territory of the Republic of Colombia, and the sovereignty of such territory being actually vested in the Republic of Panama, the high contracting parties have resolved for that purpose to conclude a convention and have accordingly appointed as their plenipotentiaries – the President of the United States of America, John Hay, Secretary of State, and the Government of the Republic of Panama, Philippe Bunau-Varilla, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Panama, thereunto specially empowered by said government, who after communicating with each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon and concluded the following articles:

### ARTICLE I

The United States guarantees and will maintain the independence of the Republic of Panama.

### ARTICLE II

The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of a zone of land and land under water for the construction maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of said Canal of the width of ten miles extending to the distance of five miles on each side of the center line of the route of the Canal to be constructed; the said zone beginning in the Caribbean Sea three marine miles from mean low water mark and extending to and across the Isthmus of Panama into the Pacific ocean to a distance of three marine miles from mean low water mark with the proviso that the cities of Panama and Colon and the harbors adjacent to said cities, which are included within the boundaries of the zone above described, shall not be included within this grant. The Republic of Panama further grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation and control of any other lands and waters outside of the zone above described which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the said Canal or of any auxiliary canals or other works necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the said enterprise.

The Republic of Panama further grants in like manner to the United States in perpetuity all islands within the limits of the zone above described and in addition thereto the group of small islands in the Bay of Panama, named, Perico, Naos, Culebra and Flamenco.

## ARTICLE III

The Republic of Panama grants to the United States all the rights, power and authority within the zone mentioned and described in Article II of this agreement and within the limits of all auxiliary lands and waters mentioned and described in said Article II which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory within which said lands and waters are located to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority.

## ARTICLE IV

As rights subsidiary to the above grants the Republic of Panama grants in perpetuity to the United States the right to use the rivers, streams, lakes and other bodies of water within its limits for navigation, the supply of water or water-power or other purposes, so far as the use of said rivers, streams, lakes and bodies of water and the waters thereof may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the said Canal.

## ARTICLE V

The Republic of Panama grants to the United States in perpetuity a monopoly for the construction, maintenance and operation of any system of communication by means of canal or railroad across its territory between the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean.

(...)

## ARTICLE X

The Republic of Panama agrees that there shall not be imposed any taxes, national, municipal, departmental, or of any other class, upon the Canal, the railways and auxiliary works, tugs and other vessels employed in by service of the Canal, store houses, work shops, offices, quarters for laborers, factories of all kinds, warehouses, wharves, machinery and other works, property, and effects appertaining to the Canal or railroad and auxiliary works, or their officers or employees, situated within the cities of Panama and Colon, and that there shall not be imposed contributions or charges of a personal character of any kind upon officers, employees, laborers, and other individuals in the service of the Canal and railroad and auxiliary works.

(...)

## ARTICLE XIV

As the price or compensation for the rights, powers and privileges granted in this convention by the Republic of Panama to the United States, the Government of the United States agrees to pay to the Republic of Panama the sum of ten million dollars (\$10,000,000) in gold coin of the United States on the exchange of the ratification of this convention and also an annual payment during the life of this convention of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$250,000) in like gold coin, beginning nine years after the date aforesaid.

The provisions of this Article shall be in addition to all other benefits assured to the Republic of Panama under this convention.

But no delay or difference opinion under this Article or any other provisions of this treaty shall affect or interrupt the full operation and effect of this convention in all other respects.

(...)

## ARTICLE XXIII

If it should become necessary at any time to employ armed forces for the safety or protection of the Canal, or of the ships that make use of the same, or the railways and auxiliary works, the United States shall have the right, at all times and in its discretion,

to use its police and its land and naval forces or to establish fortifications for these purposes.

## Torrijos-Carter Treaties, September 7, 1977

The Jimmy Carter administration was making strong efforts to improve the image of American foreign policy. One of the instruments of those efforts was the promotion of human rights, democracy and the condemnation of authoritarian governments. The Carter administration decided to reformulate previous US policy based in the Latin American region to almost unconditional support for all regimes that presented a strong anti-communist attitude. President Carter started to withdraw American economic and military assistance for the regimes commonly known for their antidemocratic governance. One of the symbols of US support for the military regimes in Latin America was the Panama Canal Zone where a famous School of the Americas – a military academy for Latin American officers where they were taught how to fight with guerilla movements and maintain internal order – was located. The Canal and the Canal Zone were symbols of American imperialism and the unfair treatment of Latin America. Also, The Canal Zone was the arena of frequent turmoil between American soldiers and the Panamanian citizens. Apart from the economic conditions of US control over the Canal and the Canal Zone, there were also others sources of conflicts, on both its sides. One of them was the extraterritoriality of the Canal Zone and the rights of Panamanian citizens in the Zone. For example, there were several crises related to the right to hang the flag of Panama. During the 1960s, there were several violent turmoil and protests of Panama citizens against American presence and the privileged position in the Canal Zone.

This is why, president Jimmy Carter decided to start negotiations with the Panama government on a new agreement that would regulate all aspects of the Canal. It coincided with the activities of General Omar Torrijos Herrera who governed Panama since October of 1968. The General defined the ultimate victory in the struggle for the Panama rights to the Canal and its Zone as his principal objective. However, negotiations with the United States were very difficult as there were strong convictions that the exclusive rights to the Canal constitute a national security priority for the United States. It was during the Carter presidency that negotiations between both countries entered the new phase. Finally, President Jimmy Carter and Omar Torrijos – the head of the Panama's government signed two treaties on September 7, 1977: *Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal* and the *Panama Canal Treaty*. However, the new treaties were very controversial for US congressmen, Congress ratified both treaties in March and April 1978 by a margin of only one vote. Additionally, the US Senate approved a special protocol that was attached to the *Treaty Concerning Permanent*

*Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal*, which maintained the American right to use military force in Panama if the security of the Canal would be endangered.

## Panama Canal Treaty, September 7, 1977

Source: [http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/panama/pa\\_appnb.html](http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/panama/pa_appnb.html) (23.09.2013)

The United States of America and the Republic of Panama, (...) Acknowledging the Republic of Panama's sovereignty over its territory, have decided to terminate the prior Treaties pertaining to the Panama Canal and to conclude a new Treaty to serve as the basis for a new relationship between them and, accordingly, have agreed upon the following:

### Article I

#### Abrogation of Prior Treaties and Establishment of a New Relationship

##### 1. Upon its entry into force, this Treaty terminates and supersedes:

- (a) The Isthmian Canal Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Washington, November 18, 1903;
- (b) The Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation signed at Washington, March 2, 1936, and the Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation and the related memorandum of Understandings Reached, signed at Panama, January 25, 1955, between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama;
- (c) All other treaties, conventions, agreements, and exchanges of notes between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama concerning the Panama Canal, which were in force prior to the entry into force of this Treaty; and
- (d) Provisions concerning the Panama Canal, which appear in other treaties, conventions, agreements, and exchanges of notes between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, which were in force prior to the entry into force of this Treaty.

(...)

### Article II

##### 2. This Treaty shall terminate at noon, Panama time, December 31, 1999.

(...)

### Article III

#### Canal Operation and Management

1. The Republic of Panama, as territorial sovereign, grants to the United States of America the rights to manage, operate, and maintain the Panama Canal, its complementary works, installations, and equipment and to provide for the orderly transit of vessels through the Panama Canal. The United States of America accepts the grant of such rights and undertakes to exercise them in accordance with this Treaty and related agreements.

(...)

## Article IV

### Protection and Defense

1. The United States of America and the Republic of Panama commit themselves to protect and defend the Panama Canal. Each Party shall act, in accordance with its constitutional processes, to meet the danger resulting from an armed attack or other actions which threaten the security of the Panama Canal or of ships transiting it.

2. For the duration of this Treaty, the United States of America shall have primary responsibility to protect and defend the Canal.

(...)

## Article XIII

### Property Transfer and Economic Participation by the Republic of Panama

1. Upon termination of this Treaty, the Republic of Panama shall assume total responsibility for the management, operation, and maintenance of the Panama Canal, which shall be turned over in operating condition and free of liens and debts, except as the two Parties may otherwise agree.

## Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal, September 7, 1977

Source: [http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/panama/pa\\_appnb.html](http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/panama/pa_appnb.html) (23.09.2013)

The United States of America and the Republic of Panama have agreed upon the following:

### Article I

The Republic of Panama declares that the Canal, as an international transit waterway, shall be permanently neutral in accordance with the regime established in this Treaty. The same regime of neutrality shall apply to any other international waterway that may be built either partially or wholly in the territory of the Republic of Panama.

### Article II

The Republic of Panama declares the neutrality of the Canal in order that both in time of peace and in time of war it shall remain secure and open to peaceful transit by the vessels of all nations on terms of entire equality, so that there will be no discrimination against any nation, or its citizens or subjects, concerning the conditions or charges of transit, or for any other reason, and so that the Canal, and therefore the Isthmus of Panama, shall not be the target of reprisals in any armed conflict between other nations of the world.

(...)

### Article V

After the termination of the Panama Canal Treaty, only the Republic of Panama shall operate the Canal and maintain military forces, defense sites and military installations within its national territory.

## Amendments made by US Senate March 16, 1978

Source: [http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/panama/pa\\_appnb.html](http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/panama/pa_appnb.html) (23.09.2013)

### (b) CONDITIONS

(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of Article V or any other provision of the Treaty, if the Canal is closed, or its operations are interfered with, the United States of America and the Republic of Panama shall each independently have the right to take such steps as each deems necessary, in accordance with its constitutional processes, including the use of military force in the Republic of Panama, to reopen the Canal or restore the operations of the Canal, as the case may be.

(2) The instruments of ratification of the Treaty shall be exchanged only upon the conclusion of a Protocol of Exchange, to be signed by authorized representatives of both Governments, which shall constitute an integral part of the Treaty documents and which shall include the following:

"Nothing in the Treaty shall preclude the Republic of Panama and the United States of America from making, in accordance with their respective constitutional processes, any agreement or arrangement between the two countries to facilitate performance at any time after December 31, 1999, of their responsibilities to maintain the regime of neutrality established in the Treaty, including agreements or arrangements for the stationing of any United States military forces or the maintenance of defense sites after that date in the Republic of Panama that the Republic of Panama and the United States of America may deem necessary or appropriate."

## Chapter Four

# At the Turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Century

US-Latin American relations entered a new phase at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century. With the growing power of the United States in the area of economy, but also in the sphere of international politics and military affairs, US diplomacy paid more attention to the region nearest its border. The American desire of extra-continental expansion also referred to the Latin American and Caribbean region. With its growing potential, the United States had broader spectrum of foreign policy instruments that it could use in its relations with Latin America.

At the turn of the centuries, two significant tendencies in US Latin American policy could be observed. The first one was the will to cooperate. Its most explicit example is returning to the idea of Pan Americanism and a continental cooperation. Initiated by James Blaine it was continued until the World War II and transformed into the inter-American system at the end of the 1940s. Pan Americanism evolved into a highly efficient form of mutual relations between the United States and Latin American countries.

The second most important tendency of US policy in the Western Hemisphere was its growing use of military instruments. American diplomacy several times expressed its conviction that the United States' destiny is to dominate in the region. Both the Olney Memorandum and the Roosevelt's Corollary of the Monroe Doctrine should be understood in this sense. Naturally it resulted in growing anti-Americanism among Latin Americans. The number of American military interventions in Central American and Caribbean republics was often a more explicit exemplification of US Latin American policy than conferences held from time to time. Also, the US military interventions and interference in the internal affairs of other countries made dialogue very difficult. In effect, at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, a growing lack of mutual confidence and a firm opposition toward the United States among not only Latin American politicians but also intellectuals and common citizens could be observed.

## James Blaine Opening Address at the First International American Conference, October 2, 1889

In the 1880s, American Secretary of State, James Blaine returned to the idea of Pan American cooperation in the Western Hemisphere. The reason for the recovery of Pan Americanism was the growing US presence in the Latin American and Caribbean region. As the United States was looking for possibilities of its new activity in different regions of the world, Blaine represented the group that was convinced that Latin America should be the natural sphere of US activity. He was not alone on the conviction that the economic development of the United States forced them to look for new markets. For Blaine it was obvious that Latin America should be the natural destination of American economic expansion. However, Blaine was also deeply convinced that the United States could carry out its effective expansion in the region only under the conditions of peace and cooperation. Meanwhile, the second part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Latin America was characterized by a growing number of international disputes and conflicts between Latin American states. This is why he proposed the idea of a continental conference that would initiate closer cooperation, which could result in better conditions for economic cooperation and development.

For the first time, James Blaine presented the idea of the conference of American states in 1881. He presented the aim of the conference as the construction of sustained peace that would establish friendly conditions for economic cooperation. However, internal political turmoil in the United States that was result of the President James A. Garfield's assassination resulted in Blaine losing his post and the plan being postponed. He returned to the post of Secretary of State – this time during Benjamin Harrison's administration. He also returned to his earlier idea of an inter-American conference. The conference was finally held on October 2, 1889 and lasted until April 1890. The First International American Conference initiated a new era of Pan Americanism. It was a completely different type of cooperation than that proposed by Simon Bolivar. It also served different objectives. But it seems that it had a much larger impact on the relations between the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

### James Blaine, Opening Address, October 2, 1889

Source: [http://www.archive.org/stream/internationalame00blai/internationalame-00blai\\_djvu.txt](http://www.archive.org/stream/internationalame00blai/internationalame-00blai_djvu.txt) (06.12.2013)

Gentlemen of the International American Conference: Speaking for the Government of the United States, I bid you welcome to this Capital. Speaking for the People of the United States, I bid you welcome to every section and to every State of the Union. You come in response to an invitation extended by the President on the special authorization of Congress. Your presence here is no ordinary event. It signifies much to the People of



all America to-day. It may signify far more in the days to come. No Conference of nations has ever assembled to consider the welfare of territorial possessions so vast and to contemplate the possibilities of a future so great and so inspiring. Those now sitting within these walls are empowered to speak for nations whose borders are on both the great oceans, whose northern limits are touched by the Arctic waters for a thousand miles beyond the Straits of Behring, whose southern extension furnishes human habitations farther below the equator than is elsewhere possible on the globe. The nations here represented fall but little short of twelve millions of square miles in their aggregate territorial extent, – more than three times the area of all Europe, and but little less than one-fourth part of the globe; while in respect to the power of producing the articles which are essential to human life, and those which minister to life's luxury, they constitute even a larger proportion of the entire world. These great possessions to-day have a population approaching one hundred and twenty millions; but if peopled as densely as the average of Europe, the total number would exceed one thousand millions.

While considerations of this character must inspire Americans, both South and North, with the liveliest anticipations of future grandeur and power, they must also impress them with a sense of the gravest responsibility touching the character and development of their respective nationalities. The delegates whom I am addressing can do much to establish permanent relations of confidence, respect, and friendship between the nations which they represent. They can show to the world an honorable and peaceful conference of eighteen independent American Powers, in which all shall meet together on terms of absolute equality; a conference in which there can be no attempt to coerce a single delegate against his own conception of the interests of his nation; a conference which will permit no secret understanding on any subject, but will frankly publish to the world all its conclusions; a conference which will tolerate no spirit of conquest, but will aim to cultivate an American sympathy as broad as both continents; a conference which will form no selfish alliance against the older nations from which we are proud to claim inheritance; a conference, in fine, which will seek nothing, propose nothing, endure nothing that is not in the general sense of all the delegates timely and wise and peaceful.

And yet we can not be expected to forget that our common fate has made us inhabitants of the two continents which, at the close of four centuries, are still regarded beyond the seas as the new world. Like situations beget like sympathies and impose like duties. We meet in the firm belief that the nations of America ought to be and can be more helpful, each to the other, than they now are, and that each will find advantage and profit from an enlarged intercourse with the others.

We believe that we should be drawn together more closely by the highways of the sea, and that at no distant day the railway systems of the North and South will meet upon the Isthmus and connect by land routes the political and commercial capitals of all America.

We believe that hearty cooperation, based on hearty confidence, will save all American states from the burdens and evils which have long and cruelly afflicted the older nations of the world.

We believe that a spirit of justice, of common and equal interest, between the American states, will leave no room for an artificial balance of power like unto that which has led to wars abroad and drenched Europe in blood.

We believe that friendship, avowed with candor and maintained with good faith, will remove from American states the necessity of guarding boundary lines between themselves with fortifications and military force.

We believe that standing armies, beyond those which are needful for public order and the safety of internal administration, should be unknown on both American continents.

We believe that friendship and not force, the spirit of just law and not the violence of the mob, should be the recognized rule of administration between American nations and in American nations.

To these subjects, and those which are cognate thereto, the attention of this Conference is earnestly and cordially invited by the Government of the United States. It will be a great gain when we shall acquire that common confidence on which all international friendship must rest. It will be a greater gain when we shall be able to draw the people of all American nations into closer acquaintance with each other, an end to be facilitated by more frequent and more rapid intercommunication. It will be the greatest gain when the personal and commercial relations of the American states, South and North, shall be so developed and so regulated that each shall acquire the highest possible advantage from the enlightened and enlarged intercourse of all.

Before the Conference shall formally enter upon the discussion of the subjects to be submitted to it, I am instructed by the President to invite all the delegates to be the guests of the Government of the United States during a proposed visit to various sections of the country, with the double purpose of showing to our friends from abroad the condition of our country, and of giving to our own people, in their own homes, the privilege and pleasure of extending the warm welcome of Americans to Americans.

## The Olney Memorandum, July 20, 1895

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the significance of the United States in the Western Hemisphere was much larger than a few decades earlier. With the growing consciousness among US politicians that the United States should look for its expansion outside the North American continent, some of them were underlining the importance of American dominance in that region. Firstly, American diplomacy decided to demonstrate its determination in assuring the dominating position of the United States in the Western Hemisphere by using political instruments of foreign policy. The border conflict between Venezuela and British Guyana was an occasion for this. As the latter was a British colony, the conflict naturally included Great Britain as well.

Both governments had not been able to resolve the dispute. The situation became very serious because Great Britain did not presume any border changes of its colony. The escalation of the conflict could have brought about a military solution in the form of British military intervention in South America. This was unacceptable for US diplomacy. As Americans were conscious of the growing power of the United States they also refreshed the foundations of the Monroe Doctrine which stated that any part of America can be a place of intervention of any European power. The United States did not have the possibilities to fulfill the statements of the Monroe Doctrine for some time, however, in the 1890s, the situation changed. This time, American diplomacy decided to undertake strong measures to defend the rule of the non-intervention of European powers in American affairs, by which the US diplomats understood the Western Hemisphere. In 1891 the first proposition of the United States to use arbitration to resolve the conflict appeared. It was rejected by the British.

In 1895 US Secretary of State, Richard Olney, once again make a proposal of arbitration. It took on the form of a rather firm letter to the British ambassador in the United States, Thomas F. Bayard. The letter included a request of acceptance of US arbitration in the conflict. In the explanation, Secretary of State Olney referred to the Monroe Doctrine and underlined that the US government does not accept the interference of any European country in the affairs of the American states. The British government, however, rejected the US request. This decision provoked very strong declarations of President Grover Cleveland who did not exclude the possibility of US military action. In effect of this firm American attitude, British diplomacy decided to agree on solving the conflict with Venezuela by means of good services provided by the United States.

### The Olney Memorandum, July 20, 1895

Source: <https://www.tracy.k12.ca.us/sites/rlee/Shared%20Documents/History%20of%20the%20Americas%20II/US%20Latin%20American%20Relations/Sources/The%20Olney%20Memorandum.pdf> (24.09.2014)

His Excellency Thomas F. Bayard,

(...)

To the territorial controversy between Great Britain and the Republic Venezuela, the United States has not been and, indeed, in view of its additional policy, could not be indifferent. Since the close of the negotiations initiated in 1893, Venezuela has repeatedly brought the controversy to the notice of the United States, has insisted upon its importance to the United States as well as to Venezuela, has represented it to have reached an acute stage – making definite action by the United States imperative – and has not ceased to solicit the services and support of the United States in aid of its final adjustment. (...) [T]he Government of the United States has made it clear to Great Britain and to the world that the controversy is one in which both its honor and its interests are involved and the continuance of which it can not regard with indifference.

That there are circumstances under which a nation may justly interpose in a controversy to which two or more other nations are the direct and immediate parties is an admitted canon of international law. The doctrine is ordinarily expressed in terms of the most general character and is perhaps incapable of more specific statement. (...) President Monroe, in the celebrated Message of December 2, 1823, declared that the American continents were fully occupied and were not the subjects for future colonization by European powers. (...) It was realized that it was futile to lay down such a rule unless its observance could be enforced. It was manifest that the United States was the only power in this hemisphere capable of enforcing it. It was therefore courageously declared not merely that Europe ought not to interfere in American affairs, but that any European power doing so would be regarded as antagonizing the interests and inviting the Opposition of the United States.

That America is in no part open to colonization, though the proposition was not universally admitted at the time of its first enunciation, has long been universally conceded. We are now concerned, therefore, only with that other practical application of the Monroe doctrine the disregard of which by any European power is to be deemed an act of unfriendliness towards the United States. The precise scope and limitations of this rule

cannot be too clearly apprehended. It does not establish any general protectorate by the United States over other American states. (...) It does not contemplate any interference in the internal affairs of any American state or in the relations between it and other American states. It does not justify any attempt on our part to change the established form of government of any American state or to prevent the people of such state from altering that form according to their own will and pleasure. The rule in question has but a single purpose and object. It is that no European power or combination of European powers shall forcibly deprive an American state of the right and power of self-government and of shaping for itself its own political fortunes and destinies. (...)

If for the reasons stated the forcible intrusion of European powers into American politics is to be deprecated – if, as it is to be deprecated, it should be resisted and prevented – such resistance and prevention must come from the United States. They would come from it, of course, were it made the point of attack. But, if they come at all, they must also come from it when any other American state is attacked, since only the United States has the strength adequate to the exigency.

Is it true, then, that the safety and welfare of the United States are so concerned with the maintenance of the independence of every American state as against any European power as to justify and require the interposition of the United States whenever that independence is endangered? The question can be candidly answered in but one way. The states of America, South as well as North, by geographical proximity, by natural sympathy, by similarity of governmental constitutions, are friends and allies, commercially and politically, of the United States. To allow the subjugation of any of them by an European power is, of course, to completely reverse that situation and signifies the loss of all the advantages incident to their natural relations to us. But that is not all. The people of the United States have a vital interest in the cause of popular self-government. They have secured the right for themselves and their posterity at the cost of infinite blood and treasure. They have realized and exemplified its beneficent operation by a career unexampled in point of national greatness or individual felicity. They believe it to be for the healing of all nations, and that civilization must either advance or retrograde accordingly as its supremacy is extended or curtailed. Imbued with these sentiments, the people of the United States might not impossibly be wrought up to an active propaganda in favor of a cause so highly valued both for themselves and for mankind. But the age of the Crusades has passed, and they are content with such assertion and defense of the right of popular government as their own security and welfare demand. It is in that view more than in any other that they believe it not to be tolerated that the political control of an American state shall be forcibly assumed by an European power. (...)

To-day the United States is practically sovereign on this continent, and its fiat is law upon the subjects to which it confines its interposition. Why? It is not because of the pure friendship or good will felt for it. It is not simply by reason of its high character as a civilized state, nor because wisdom and justice and equity are the invariable characteristics of the dealings of the United States. It is because, in addition to all other grounds, its infinite resources combined with its isolated position render it master of the situation and practically invulnerable as against any or all other powers.

All the advantages of this superiority are at once imperiled if the principle be admitted that European powers may convert American states into colonies or provinces of their own.

There is, then, a doctrine of American public law, well founded in principle and abundantly sanctioned by precedent, which entitles and requires the United States to treat as an injury to itself the forcible assumption by an European power of political control over an American state. The application of the doctrine to the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela remains to be made and presents no real difficulty. Though the dispute relates to a boundary line, yet, as it is between states, it necessarily imports political control to be lost by one party and gained by the other. The political control at stake, too, is of no mean importance, but concerns a domain of great extent and, if it

also directly involves the command of the mouth of the Orinoco, is of immense consequence in connection with the whole river navigation of the interior of South America.

It being clear, therefore, that the United States may legitimately insist upon the merits of the boundary question being determined, it is equally clear that there is but one feasible mode of determining them, viz., peaceful arbitration.

In these circumstances, the duty of the President appears to him unmistakable and imperative. Great Britain's assertion of title to the disputed territory combined with her refusal to have that title investigated being a substantial appropriation of the territory to her own use, not to protest and give warning that the transaction will be regarded as injurious to the interests of the people of the United States as well as oppressive in itself would be to ignore an established policy with which the honor and welfare of this country are closely identified. (...)

You are instructed, therefore, to present the foregoing views to Lord Salisbury by reading to him this communication (leaving with him a copy should he so desire). (...) They call for a definite decision upon the point whether Great Britain will consent or will decline to submit the Venezuelan boundary question in its entirety to impartial arbitration. It is the earnest hope of the President that the conclusion will be on the side of arbitration. (...) If he is to be disappointed in that hope, it is his wish to be made acquainted with the fact at such early date as will enable him to lay the whole subject before Congress in his next annual message.

## The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine

After the assassination of President William McKinley in 1901, Theodor Roosevelt assumed the presidency in the United States. He was a great supporter of the New Manifest Destiny and expansion of the United States outside the North American continent. Victory in the Spanish-American war whetted the country's appetite for expansion; during the course of 1898 the United States proceeded to establish colonial rule in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippines. President Theodore Roosevelt, who took office in 1901, continued this expansionary fervor by substantially extending the scope of the Monroe Doctrine. A conservative reformer and nativist, Theodore Roosevelt assumed the conducting of foreign relations at a critical time, in the aftermath of the war with Spain. He offered a particularly dramatic illustration of the degree to which the "rise to world power" was an affirmation of core American policy ideas. Roosevelt strongly believed in America's mission. Taking this into account, Roosevelt's interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine was not a surprise. In December 1904 during his message to the Congress, he made some important statements related to American foreign policy. As he was directly referring to the Monroe Doctrine from 1823, his vision of the US's role in international relations in the Western hemisphere is commonly known as Roosevelt's Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. The most important element of this corollary was the American right to intervene in the countries of the Western Hemisphere. According to

the American President, the United States had a right to act as a policeman in situations of turmoil in particular countries of the Latin American region and the Caribbean. Roosevelt's statements were a direct response to the debt problems of some of the Caribbean countries that could have provoked an intervention of European powers in the Western Hemisphere. His solution was to impose U.S.-appointed customs collectors on financially delinquent governments, in effect guaranteeing that foreign debts were repaid on time. In fact, the aim of Roosevelt's Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine was to serve, whether expressly mentioned or not, as the theoretical basis for the subsequent establishment of protectorates in the Caribbean.

### Theodore Roosevelt's Annual Message to Congress, December 6, 1904

Source: *The State of the Union Messages of the Presidents, 1790–1960*, ed. Fred L. Israel, vol 2. 1861–1904, Chealse House Publishers, New York, 1967, pp. 2105–2140

In treating of our foreign policy and of the attitude that this great Nation should assume in the world at large, it is absolutely necessary to consider the Army and the Navy, and the Congress, through which the thought of the Nation finds its expression, should keep ever vividly in mind the fundamental fact that it is impossible to treat our foreign policy, whether this policy takes shape in the effort to secure justice for others or justice for ourselves, save as conditioned upon the attitude we are willing to take toward our Army, and especially toward our Navy. It is not merely unwise, it is contemptible, for a nation, as for an individual, to use high-sounding language to proclaim its purposes, or to take positions which are ridiculous if unsupported by potential force, and then to refuse to provide this force. If there is no intention of providing and keeping the force necessary to back up a strong attitude, then it is far better not to assume such an attitude.

The steady aim of this Nation, as of all enlightened nations, should be to strive to bring ever nearer the day when there shall prevail throughout the world the peace of justice. There are kinds of peace which are highly undesirable, which are in the long run as destructive as any war. Tyrants and oppressors have many times made a wilderness and called it peace. Many times peoples who were slothful or timid or shortsighted, who had been enervated by ease or by luxury, or misled by false teachings, have shrunk in unmanly fashion from doing duty that was stern and that needed self-sacrifice, and have sought to hide from their own minds their shortcomings, their ignoble motives, by calling them love of peace. The peace of tyrannous terror, the peace of craven weakness, the peace of injustice, all these should be shunned as we shun unrighteous war. The goal to set before us as a nation, the goal which should be set before all mankind, is the attainment of the peace of justice, of the peace which comes when each nation is not merely safe-guarded in its own rights, but scrupulously recognizes and performs its duty toward others. Generally peace tells for righteousness; but if there is conflict between the two, then our fealty is due first to the cause of righteousness. Unrighteous wars are common, and unrighteous peace is rare; but both should be shunned. The right of freedom and the responsibility for the exercise of that right can not be divorced. One of our great poets has well and finely said that freedom is not a gift that tarries long in the hands of cowards. Neither does it tarry long in the hands of those too slothful, too dishonest, or too unintelligent to exercise it. The eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty must be exercised, sometimes to guard against outside foes; although of course far more often to guard against our own selfish or thoughtless shortcomings.

If these self-evident truths are kept before us, and only if they are so kept before us, we shall have a clear idea of what our foreign policy in its larger aspects should be. It is our duty to remember that a nation has no more right to do injustice to another nation, strong or weak, than an individual has to do injustice to another individual; that the same moral law applies in one case as in the other. But we must also remember that it is as much the duty of the Nation to guard its own rights and its own interests as it is the duty of the individual so to do. Within the Nation the individual has now delegated this right to the State, that is, to the representative of all the individuals, and it is a maxim of the law that for every wrong there is a remedy. But in international law we have not advanced by any means as far as we have advanced in municipal law. There is as yet no judicial way of enforcing a right in international law. When one nation wrongs another or wrongs many others, there is no tribunal before which the wrongdoer can be brought. Either it is necessary supinely to acquiesce in the wrong, and thus put a premium upon brutality and aggression, or else it is necessary for the aggrieved nation valiantly to stand up for its rights. Until some method is devised by which there shall be a degree of international control over offending nations, it would be a wicked thing for the most civilized powers, for those with most sense of international obligations and with keenest and most generous appreciation of the difference between right and wrong, to disarm. If the great civilized nations of the present day should completely disarm, the result would mean an immediate recrudescence of barbarism in one form or another. Under any circumstances a sufficient armament would have to be kept up to serve the purposes of international police; and until international cohesion and the sense of international duties and rights are far more advanced than at present, a nation desirous both of securing respect for itself and of doing good to others must have a force adequate for the work which it feels is allotted to it as its part of the general world duty. Therefore it follows that a self-respecting, just, and far-seeing nation should on the one hand endeavor by every means to aid in the development of the various movements which tend to provide substitutes for war, which tend to render nations in their actions toward one another, and indeed toward their own peoples, more responsive to the general sentiment of humane and civilized mankind; and on the other hand that it should keep prepared, while scrupulously avoiding wrongdoing itself, to repel any wrong, and in exceptional cases to take action which in a more advanced stage of international relations would come under the head of the exercise of the international police. A great free people owes it to itself and to all mankind not to sink into helplessness before the powers of evil.

We are in every way endeavoring to help on, with cordial good will, every movement which will tend to bring us into more friendly relations with the rest of mankind. In pursuance of this policy I shall shortly lay before the Senate treaties of arbitration with all powers which are willing to enter into these treaties with us. It is not possible at this period of the world's development to agree to arbitrate all matters, but there are many matters of possible difference between us and other nations which can be thus arbitrated. Furthermore, at the request of the Interparliamentary Union, an eminent body composed of practical statesmen from all countries, I have asked the Powers to join with this Government in a second Hague conference, at which it is hoped that the work already so happily begun at The Hague may be carried some steps further toward completion. This carries out the desire expressed by the first Hague conference itself.

It is not true that the United States feels any land hunger or entertains any projects as regards the other nations of the Western Hemisphere save such as are for their welfare. All that this country desires is to see the neighboring countries stable, orderly, and prosperous. Any country whose people conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendship. If a nation shows that it knows how to act with reasonable efficiency and decency in social and political matters, if it keeps order and pays its obligations, it need fear no interference from the United States. Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society, may in America, as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the

United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power. If every country washed by the Caribbean Sea would show the progress in stable and just civilization which with the aid of the Platt Amendment Cuba has shown since our troops left the island, and which so many of the republics in both Americas are constantly and brilliantly showing, all question of interference by this Nation with their affairs would be at an end. Our interests and those of our southern neighbors are in reality identical. They have great natural riches, and if within their borders the reign of law and justice obtains, prosperity is sure to come to them. While they thus obey the primary laws of civilized society they may rest assured that they will be treated by us in a spirit of cordial and helpful sympathy. We would interfere with them only in the last resort, and then only if it became evident that their inability or unwillingness to do justice at home and abroad had violated the rights of the United States or had invited foreign aggression to the detriment of the entire body of American nations. It is a mere truism to say that every nation, whether in America or anywhere else, which desires to maintain its freedom, its independence, must ultimately realize that the right of such independence can not be separated from the responsibility of making good use of it.

In asserting the Monroe Doctrine, in taking such steps as we have taken in regard to Cuba, Venezuela, and Panama, and in endeavoring to circumscribe the theater of war in the Far East, and to secure the open door in China, we have acted in our own interest as well as in the interest of humanity at large. There are, however, cases in which, while our own interests are not greatly involved, strong appeal is made to our sympathies. Ordinarily it is very much wiser and more useful for us to concern ourselves with striving for our own moral and material betterment here at home than to concern ourselves with trying to better the condition of things in other nations. We have plenty of sins of our own to war against, and under ordinary circumstances we can do more for the general uplifting of humanity by striving with heart and soul to put a stop to civic corruption, to brutal lawlessness and violent race prejudices here at home than by passing resolutions and wrongdoing elsewhere. Nevertheless there are occasional crimes committed on so vast a scale and of such peculiar horror as to make us doubt whether it is not our manifest duty to endeavor at least to show our disapproval of the deed and our sympathy with those who have suffered by it. The cases must be extreme in which such a course is justifiable. There must be no effort made to remove the mote from our brother's eye if we refuse to remove the beam from our own. But in extreme cases action may be justifiable and proper. What form the action shall take must depend upon the circumstances of the case; that is, upon the degree of the atrocity and upon our power to remedy it. The cases in which we could interfere by force of arms as we interfered to put a stop to intolerable conditions in Cuba are necessarily very few. Yet it is not to be expected that a people like ours, which in spite of certain very obvious shortcomings, nevertheless as a whole shows by its consistent practice its belief in the principles of civil and religious liberty and of orderly freedom, a people among whom even the worst crime, like the crime of lynching, is never more than sporadic, so that individuals and not classes are molested in their fundamental rights – it is inevitable that such a nation should desire eagerly to give expression to its horror on an occasion like that of the massacre of the Jews in Kishenev, or when it witnesses such systematic and long-extended cruelty and oppression as the cruelty and oppression of which the Armenians have been the victims, and which have won for them the indignant pity of the civilized world.

(...)



## The Fourth International American Conference, July 20 – August 30, 1910

In the summer of 1910 the representatives of Latin American countries met in Buenos Aires to participate in the Fourth International American Conference. As the relations between the United States and its southern neighbors were dominated by US interventionism in the region, the mutual perception was not very cordial. However both sides were aware of the importance of the Pan American initiative. The United States perceived it as an instrument that had been permitted for a broader implementation of American interests in the Western Hemisphere, meanwhile a majority of Latin American states had treated Pan Americanism as an instrument of pressure for the United States and a balance for American interventionism. In this situation, both sides were interested in enhancing the institutions that had already existed. During the fourth conference, representatives of American states signed a resolution which introduced important institutional changes that constituted the basis of Pan American cooperation until the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. Here are two resolutions related to the institutional reorganization of “Union of American Republics” and the Pan American Union.

### Resolution

#### Reorganization of the “Union of American Republics”

Source: *The International Conferences of American States, 1889–1928*, ed. James Brown Scott, Oxford University Press, New York/London, 1931, pp. 172–176

The undersigned, Delegates of the Republics represented in the Fourth International American Conference, duly authorized by their respective Governments, have approved the following resolution:

The Fourth International American Conference resolves:

#### Article I.

To maintain, under the name of “Union of American Republics,” the International Union created by the First, and confirmed by the Second and Third Conferences, and under the name of “Pan American Union” the institutions serving as its Agent and having its seat in the Building of the American Republics in the City of Washington, D.C.

The purposes of the “Pan American Union” are the following:

1. to compile and distribute commercial information and prepare commercial reports;
2. to compile and classify information respecting the treaties and conventions between the American Republics, and between these and other States, and their legislation in force;
3. to supply information on educational matters;

4. to prepare reports on questions assigned to it by resolutions of the International American Conferences;
5. to assist in obtaining the ratification of the Resolutions and Conventions adopted by the different Conferences;
6. to carry into effect all resolutions, the execution of which may have been assigned or may hereafter be assigned to it by the International American Conference;
7. to act as a Permanent Committee of the International American Conferences, recommending topics to be included in the programme of the next Conference; such projects must be communicated to the various Governments forming the Union, at least six months before the date of the meeting of the next Conference;
8. to submit within the same period a report to the various Governments on the work of the "Pan American Union" during the term covered since the meeting of the last conference and also special reports on any matter which may have been referred to it for report;
9. to keep the records of the International American Conferences.

#### Article II

The control of the "Pan American Union" is vested in a Governing Board consisting of the diplomatic representatives of all the Governments of said Republics accredited to the Government of the United States of America, and the Secretary of State of the United States, on whom the American Republics have conferred the presidency of the Governing Board.

(...)

#### Article X

There shall be in the Capital of each of the Republics of this Union a Pan-American Commission responsible to the Minister of Foreign Affairs consisting, if possible, of persons who have been Delegates to some International American Conference, their functions being:

- a) to obtain the approval of the resolutions adopted by these Conferences;
- b) To furnish accurately and without delay to the "Pan-American Union" all the data needed in the preparation of its work;
- c) To submit of their own initiative any projects they may deem proper to foster the interest of the Union, and to exercise such further functions as the respective Governments may entrust to them.

(...)

#### Article XVI

The American Republics bind themselves to continue to support the "Pan American Union" for a term of ten years from this date, and to pay annually into the Treasury of the "Pan American Union" their respective quotas. Any of the Republics may cease to belong to the Union of American Republics upon notice to the Governing Board, two years earlier in advance. The "Pan American Union" shall continue for successive term of ten years unless twelve months before the expiration of such term a majority of the members of the Union shall express the wish, through the Secretary of State of the United States of America, to withdraw therefrom on the expiration of the term.

## Resolution. Pan-American Union

Source: the International Conferences of American States, 1889–1928, ed. James Brown Scott, Oxford University Press, New York/London, 1931, pp. 176–179

The undersigned, Delegates of the Republics represented in the Fourth International American Conference, duly authorized by their respective Governments, have approved the following Resolution:

There having been submitted to the consideration of the Conference the proposal to agree upon a permanent organization of the "Pan-American Union," be it resolved:

To recommend to the Governments of the American Republics that they consider the proposal of assuring the continued development and permanent existence of the "Pan-American Union" by means of a Convention based on the following stipulations:

### PROJECT OF A CONVENTION

The Governments of the United States of America, Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Brazil, Chili, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, Uruguay and Venezuela, desiring to put on a more permanent basis International Bureau of the American Republics, created by the First International Conference of American States and confirmed by the Second, Third, and Fourth Conferences, have resolved to conclude a Convention to that end; and for that purpose, Plenipotentiaries:

After having communicated to each other their respective full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

#### Article I

The "Union of the American Republics":, constituted by the signatory States, maintains under the name of the "Pan-American Union" the Institution which acts as its organ and has its seat in the building of the American Republics in the City of Washington.

#### Article II

The functions of "Pan-American Union" are:

1. to compile and distribute information and reports concerning the commercial, industrial, agricultural, and educational development, as well as the general progress of the American countries.
2. to compile and classify information referring to the treaties and Conventions concluded among the American Republics and between these and other States, as well as to the legislation of the former.
3. to assist in the development of commercial and intellectual relations between American Republics and of their more intimate mutual acquaintance.
4. to act as a permanent commission of the International American Conferences; to keep their records and archives; to assist on obtaining the ratification of the Resolutions and Conventions adopted; to prepare or initiate projects which may be included in the programme of the subsequent Conference, to communicate such projects to the different Governments of the Union at least six months in advance; and to prepare the programme and regulations of each Conference.
5. to submit to the various Governments, three months before the meeting of each Conference, a report upon the work of the Institution since the closing of the last Conference, and also special reports upon any matter which may have been referred to it.

6. to perform such other functions as may be conferred by the Conference or by the Governing Board.

### Article III

There shall be established, in the Capital of each of the Republics of the Union, a "Pan-American Commission," attached to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and composed as far as possible of former delegates to an International American Conference. The Commission shall have the following duties:

- a) to assist in securing the approval of the resolutions adopted by the Conference.
- b) To furnish the "Pan-American Union" with promptness and in a complete manner all the information it may need in the preparation of its work.
- c) To present upon their own initiative, projects which they may consider adapted to the purposes of the Union and to fulfill such other functions which in view of these purposes may be conferred upon them by the Governments.

### Article IV

The Governments of "Pan-American Union" shall be vested in the Governing Board constituted by the diplomatic representatives of the American Governments, accredited to the Government of the United States of America, upon whom the Republics of the America have conferred the presidency of the Governing Board.

In absence of the Secretary of State, one of the diplomatic representatives in Washington, who may be present shall preside over the sessions of the Governing Board, in the order of diplomatic rank and seniority, and with the character of Vice-President.

An American Government which may not have a diplomatic representative at Washington may confer its representation in the Governing Board upon any other member of the said Board; in this case such representative shall have one vote for each country represented.

The Governing Board shall hold regular sessions every month, with the exception of June, July and August, and extraordinary sessions when convoked by the President, either upon his own initiative, or upon petition of two members of the Board. The attendance of five members at ordinary or special sessions shall be sufficient to constitute a quorum.

### Article V

The Director-General of the "Pan-American Union" shall present at the regular session in November, a detailed Budget of the expenses of the following year. The Budget, after being approved by the Governing Board, shall be communicated to the Signatory Governments with an indication of the quota, fixed in proportion to population, which each Government shall pay to the Treasury of the "Pan-American Union" not later than the first of July in each year.

The Governing Board shall elect from among its members a Committee charged with examining, on the dates determined by the Board, the accounts of the expenditures of the Union, in conformity with the financial arrangements established by the Regulations.

### Article VI

The Governing Board shall appoint the following officers: A Director General, who shall have charge of the administration of the "Pan-American Union," with power to promote its most ample development, in accordance with the present Statutes, with the Regulations, and with the resolutions of the Governing Board to whom he shall be responsible.

An Assistant Director who shall also act as Secretary of the Governing Board.

The remainder of the personnel and their duties shall be determined by the Regulations.

The Director General shall prepare, with the approval of the Governing Board, the internal regulations by which the various services of the "Pan-American Union" shall be governed.

#### Article VII

The "Pan-American Union" shall publish a monthly bulletin dealing with the matters contained in the first paragraphs of the article II of this Convention, as well as such other works as the Governing Board may determine. In order to assure the greatest possible accuracy in these publications, each Signatory State shall transmit directly to the "Pan-American Union" two copies of the official documents or publications which may relate to matters connected with the purposes of the Union.

All the correspondence and publications of the Union shall be carried free of charge by the mails of the American Republics.

#### Article VIII

The "Pan-American Union" shall be governed by the Regulations adopted by the Governing Board in accordance with this Convention.

#### Article IX

The ratification of the present Convention by the nations of America shall be communicated to the Secretary of State of the United States of America, who, in turn shall give formal notice of such ratification to each one of the Signatory States.

In case on of the Signatory Governments should desire to withdraw from the present Convention, it may do so by giving formal notice of its intention to the Secretary of State of the United States of the America, two years in advance; and the Secretary of State of the United States shall communicate such notice to the Governments of the Union and to the Governing Board. Any Signatory Government which may have denounced the present Convention may again adhere to it in the manner prescribed above.

(...)

## Woodrow Wilson Non-recognition Doctrine

The issue of the promotion of democracy by the United States has been one of the major questions of American foreign policy since the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. From the Spanish-American war until the last interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan, Americans have argued the relevance of their own national interest of encouraging democracy for others and the proper means for doing so where it has seemed appropriate. The period of Woodrow Wilson's presidency is probably the most important for analyzing the American mission understood as the promotion of democratic values. Upon becoming president in 1913, Wilson found three policy instruments at his disposal for use in Latin America. They were as follows, in order of importance: limited military occupation and control of custom chamber; economic influence; and international agreements. Wilson, as a well-

known idealist, denounced the earlier reliance on force in international relations. He also intended to repudiate the practices of dollar diplomacy. It would therefore appear that Wilson planned to rely principally on the use of international agreements to secure American interests in the region. However, the reality of Latin American politics forced President Wilson to change his intentions and plans.

The direct reason for announcing the Wilson doctrine was the events in Mexico. The *golpe de estado* of Victoriano Huerta and the death of the father of the Mexican Revolution – Francisco Madero – coincided with the beginning of Wilson's presidential term. His idealistic views on international relations resulted in his not recognizing Huerta's government. He made his policy toward Mexico into a general practice toward all Latin American states, the non-recognition of any government that gained power in an unconstitutional way and subverted the liberties of its people. Wilson spoke frankly that the aim of US policy was to remove usurpers such as General Huerta in Mexico.

#### A statement on Relations with Latin America, March 11, 1913

Source: The Papers of Woodrow Wilson (1913), ed. Arthur S. Link, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1978, vol. 27, pp. 169–170 and 172–173

<http://images.library.wisc.edu/FRUS/EFacs/1913/reference/frus.frus1913.i0005.pdf>  
(25.09.2013)

One of the chief objects of my administration will be to cultivate the friendship and deserve the confidence of our sister republics of Central and South America, and to promote in every proper and honorable way the interests which are common to the peoples of the two continents. I earnestly desire the most cordial understanding and cooperation between the peoples and leaders of America and, therefore, deem it my duty to make this brief statement.

(...)

Cooperation is possible only when supported at every turn by the orderly processes of just government based upon law, not upon arbitrary or irregular force. We hold, as I am sure all thoughtful leaders of republican government everywhere hold, that just government rests always upon the consent of the governed, and that there can be no freedom without order based upon law and upon the public conscience and approval. We shall look to make these principles the basis of mutual intercourse, respect, and helpfulness between our sister republics and ourselves. We shall lend our influence of every kind to the realization of these principles in fact and practice, knowing that disorder, personal intrigues, and defiance of constitutional rights weaken and discredit government and injure none so much as the people who are unfortunate enough to have their common life and then common affairs so tainted and disturbed. We can have no sympathy with those who seek to seize the power of government to advance their own personal interests or ambition. We are the friends of peace, but we know that there can be no lasting or stable peace in such circumstances. As friends, therefore, we shall prefer those who act in the interest of peace and honor, who protect private rights, and respect the restraints of constitutional provision. Mutual respect seems to us the indispensable foundation of friendship between states, as between individuals.

The United States has nothing to seek in Central and South America except the lasting interests of the peoples of the two continents, the security of governments intended for the people and for no special group or interest, and the development of personal and trade relationships between the two continents which shall redound to the profit and advantage of both and interfere with the rights and liberties of neither.

From these principles may be read so much of the future policy of this Government as it is necessary now to forecast, and in the spirit of these principles I may, I hope, be permitted with as much confidence as earnestness to extend to the Governments of all the Republics of America the hand of genuine disinterested friendship, and to pledge my own honor and the honor of my colleagues to every enterprise of peace and amity that a fortunate future may disclose.

## A Latin American Doctrine of Anti-imperialism, Victor Haya de la Torre, 1926

At the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century, Latin America was the region where important processes were taking place. Some of them were caused by foreign or international factors. Growing American interventionism in the Western Hemisphere could generally be observed. A large number of US military interventions in Latin American and Caribbean countries had awakened firm anti-Americanism. Also, the economic policy of the United States in the region that was focused on the exploitation of natural resources in Latin American countries was perceived among their citizens as a form of imperialism or even quasi colonialism. As the United States already became a symbol of a capitalist model of development, strong anti-Americanism was often treated similarly to anti-capitalism and anti-imperialism. This was strengthened by the growing popularity of leftist ideologies, including the radical ones. The process coincided with another phenomenon – the significant strengthening of the national identity building in particular states. All those tendencies were already visible in the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, for example in the writings of Jose Martí. The first years and decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century only intensified those tendencies.

Victor Haya de la Torre was a Peruvian politician who dedicated his public activity to the struggle with inequalities and the exploitation of workers. He is one of the most important politicians not only in the history of Peru but also in the regional dimension. It was Haya de la Torre who created the APRA (American Popular Revolutionary Alliance) – one of the very first modern political parties in Latin America. He presented a firm anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist stance. In one of his texts he explained the very nature of the APRA and the anti-imperialist nature of the party.

## What is the A.P.R.A.?

Source: <http://pl.scribd.com/doc/64904036/Whats-is-the-APRA-Haya-de-la-Torre-1926>  
(21.01.2014)

The struggle organised in Latin America against Yankee Imperialism, by means of united international front of manual and intellectual workers with a programme of common action, that is the A.P.R.A., the four initial letters of the following words: Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana (Popular Revolutionary American Alliance).

### **Its Programme**

The Programme of international action of the A.P.R.A. has five general points which serve as a basis for the national sections:

1. action of the countries of Latin America against Yankee Imperialism,
2. the political unity of Latin America,
3. the nationalization of land and industry,
4. the internationalization of the Panama Canal,
5. the solidarity of all oppressed people and classes of the world.

### **Its organization**

The A.P.R.A. is a young organization formed by the young men of the new generation of manual and intellectual workers of Latin America. it was founded in 1924 and has organized sections in various countries in Latin America and also in Europe, where the number of anti-Imperialist Latin American students is pretty large. The principal sections of the A.P.R.A. are at present working in Mexico, Buenos Aires, Central America, Paris, and other places in which for political reasons the action of these sections is not publicly allowed. A Central Executive Committee directs the actions of all the sections.

### **The United Front**

The A.P.R.A. organizes the great Latin American Anti-Imperialist united front and works to include in its ranks all those who in one way or another have struggle and are still struggling against the North American danger in Latin America. Until 1923 this danger was regarded as a possible struggle of races – the Saxon and the Latin races – as a “conflict of cultures” or as a question of nationalism. From the “Gonzalez Prada” Popular Universities of Peru a new conception of the problem has arisen: the economic conception. In 1924 the first Pan-American Anti-Imperialist League was formed in Mexico and also the Latin American Union in Buenos Aires. The Anti-Imperialist Leagues were the first endeavour of the international united front of workers, peasants and students against Yankee Imperialism. The Latin American Union as the Anti-Imperialist Frente Unico of the Intellectuals. As a matter of fact, the Anti-Imperialist Leagues have no fixed political programme, but only that of resistance to Imperialism, and the Latin American Union has simply intellectual activity. The A.P.R.A. was founded in 1924, with a programme of revolutionary and political action, and it invites all the scattered forces to form themselves in a single great front.

### **The class struggle against Imperialism**

The history of political and economic relations between Latin American and the United States, especially the experience of the Mexican Revolution leads to the following conclusions:



1. the governing classes of Latin American countries – landowners, middle class or merchants – are allies of North American Imperialism.
2. these classes have the political power in our countries, in exchange for a policy concessions, of loans, of great operations which they – capitalists, landowners or merchants and politicians of the Latin American dominant classes – share with Imperialism.
3. as a result of this alliance the natural resources which form the riches of our countries are mortgaged or sold, and the working or agricultural classes are subjected to the most brutal servitude. Again, this alliance produces political events which result in the loss of national sovereignty: Panama, Nicaragua, Cuba, Santo Domingo, are really protectorates of the United States.

### **The international struggle against Imperialism**

As the problem is common to all Latin American countries, in which the dominant classes are allies of Imperialism in joint exploitation of the working classes, it is not isolated or national question, but is international among the twenty Latin American republics. But the governing classes encourage divisions among these republics, assisting the Imperialist plan which fears Latin American unity (covering eight millions of square miles and about ninety millions of inhabitants). The governing classes stir up national feeling and national conflicts, as in the case of Peru against Chile, Brazil against Argentina, Ecuador and Colombia against Peru, etc. Every time that the United States intervenes as an "amicable mediator" they arrange matters purposely so that no definite settlement can be arrived at which might produce a principle of unification. The recent question of Tacna and Arica between Peru and Chile is the clearest demonstration of this policy of Imperialism.

Imperialism cannot be overthrown without the Political Unity of Latin America.

The experience of history, especially that of Mexico, shows that the immense power of American Imperialism cannot be overthrown without the Unity of Latin American countries. Against this unity the national dominant classes, middle class, landowners etc, whose political power is almost always buttressed by the agitation of nationalism or patriotism of countries hostile to their neighbours, are ranged. Consequently the overthrow of the governing classes is indispensable, political power must be captured by the workers, and Latin America must be united in a Federation of States. This is one of the great political objects of the A.P.R.A.

(...)

### **Conclusion**

The A.P.R.A. represents, therefore, the political organisation struggling against Imperialism and against The national governing classes which are its auxiliaries and its allies in Latin America. The A.P.R.A. is the united front of the toiling classes (workers, peasants, natives of the soil) united with students intellectuals revolutionaries etc. The A.P.R.A. is an autonomous movement, completely Latin American, without foreign interventions or influences. It is the result of a spontaneous movement in defense of our countries in view of the experiences of Mexico, Central America, Panama, and the Antilles, and the present position of Peru, Bolivia, and Venezuela where the policy of "penetration" by Imperialism is already keenly felt. For this our watchword is to be the following: "Against Yankee Imperialism, for the unity of the peoples of Latin America, for the realization of social justice."

Paris, October, 1926



## Chapter Five

# Good Neighbor Policy

After several decades of a unilateral US policy in the Western Hemisphere and imperialistic tendencies in its relations with Latin American countries, the United States decided to change its policy in the region. This was dictated by several causes. Firstly, the end of the 1920s and the beginning of the 1930s was the time of Great Depression and the United States decided to change its economic policy in the region. Also, after a few decades of aggressive Latin American policy that was full of military interventions and interferences in the internal affairs of particular countries of the region, President Herbert Hoover and the FDR administration decided to change the principles of US Latin American policy. As the political situation in Europe was getting more complicated after assuming power in Germany by Adolf Hitler, the United States also wanted to ensure allies in its nearest neighborhood. The mechanisms for this new concept of this Latin American policy already had existed. It was based, in principle, on the Pan American movement initiated by United States diplomacy at the end of the 1880s. The most important matter was to regain the confidence of its Latin American neighbors. In practice, only one US decision could convince Latin American countries to the good intentions of the United States – a clear declaration that the United States would resign from military intervention as an instrument of its foreign policy in the region. For Latin Americans this was crucial evidence of the US's will to cooperate in the future and its resignation from unilateral policy. Meanwhile, for the United States, this kind of declaration was still too far-reaching. It would mean a resignation from one of the principle instruments of its foreign policy in the region. As the idea of the new attitude in the US Latin American policy appeared during the Hoover administration, it was his successor, Franklin Delano Roosevelt who decided on this important step. In effect, during the Pan American conference in Montevideo, 1933, the United States agreed to resign from military intervention as an instrument of its foreign policy in the Latin American and Caribbean region. This was one of the most important decisions in the relations between the United States and Latin America. Also, it was the most meaningful symbol of the good neighbor policy as this new attitude was called.

It started a period of several years of cooperation and friendly relations between the United States and the Latin American countries. After decades of disputes and sometimes open hostility, the United States and Latin American countries established a mechanism of effective cooperation. Although the neighborhood was still not easy it can be described as a good one, in a sense that a great majority of disputes were resolved in a peaceful

manner and there were always attempts to find mutually satisfactory solutions. It is necessary to emphasize that it would have been much more difficult to carry out the good neighbor policy – especially for US diplomacy – without a war disaster in Europe and Far East.

## The Clark Memorandum, December 17, 1928

The end of the third decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century brought significant changes both in world international relations and in inter-American relations. The most important change took place in US Latin American policy. Based on the Theodore Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine – that included US interventionism in the region – and a strong economic expansion, the previous American policy in the Western Hemisphere was a source of strong disputes with Latin American countries. One of the effects of this kind of US Latin American policy was firm anti-Americanism.

The first symptoms of the new attitude of the American politicians toward the southern neighbors of the United States were already visible during the Herbert Hoover presidential term. It was Hoover's administration that initiated new forms of Latin American policy. One of the first initiators of the new policy was Ruben J. Clark, Undersecretary of State. He prepared a long document – later known as the Clark Memorandum – which was a broad suggestion of the future US foreign policy. Its most important part was dedicated to the Monroe Doctrine and its interpretations. Clark criticized the interpretation presented in 1904 by President Theodore Roosevelt. According to the Undersecretary of State, the Monroe Doctrine should not be a source of US interventionism in the countries of the Western Hemisphere. It was a significant change in both understanding the Monroe Doctrine and the formulation of basic instruments of US Latin American policy. Clark's document was not published by US diplomacy until the 1930s. However, some indication of the new attitude in US Latin American policy was already visible, for example, in the withdrawal of US troops from Nicaragua and Haiti. The eruption of the Great Depression and internal economic disaster in the United States forced Hoover to concentrate on the economic crisis in the United States.

## The Clark Memorandum, Ruben J. Clark, December 17, 1928

Source: <http://www.webcitation.org/6485wLY7Q> (26.09.2013)

Herewith I transmit a Memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine, prepared by your direction, given a little over two months ago. (...)

It is of first importance to have in mind that Monroe's declaration in its terms, relates to the relationships between European states on the one side, and, on the other side, the American continents, the Western Hemisphere, and the Latin American Governments which on December 2, 1823, had declared and maintained their independence which we had acknowledged.

In the normal case, the Latin American state against which aggression was aimed by a European power, would be the beneficiary of the Doctrine not its victim. This has been the history of its application. The Doctrine makes the United States a guarantor, in effect, of the independence of Latin American states, though without the obligations of a guarantor to those states, for the United States itself determines by its sovereign will when, where, and concerning what aggressions it will invoke the Doctrine, and by what measures, if any, it will apply a sanction. In none of these things has any other state any voice whatever.

Furthermore while the Monroe Doctrine as declared, has no relation in its terms to an aggression by any other state than a European state, yet the principle "self-preservation" which underlies the Doctrine which principle, as we shall see, is as fully operative without the Doctrine as with it – would apply to any non-American state in whatever quarter of the globe it lay, or even to an American state, if the aggressions of such state against other Latin American states were "dangerous to our peace and safety," or were a "manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States," or were "endangering our peace and happiness;" that is, if such aggressions challenged our existence. (...)

In this view, the Monroe Doctrine as such might be wiped out and the United States would lose nothing of its broad, international right; it would still possess, in common with every other member of the family of nations, the internationally recognized right of self-preservation, and this right would fully attach to the matters specified by the Doctrine if and whenever they threatened our existence, just as the right would attach in relation to any other act carrying a like menace.

(...)

## Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the Good Neighbor Policy

The idea of the good neighbor policy survived despite the change of the presidential administration. In 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Democratic Party candidate, won

the presidential election. His principal objectives, however, were related to internal economic affairs, he maintained the foundations of US Latin American policy initiated by his predecessor. He underlined this in his inaugural address on March 4, 1933. The idea of good neighbor policy was broadly explained by the President during his speech on the occasion of celebrating Pan American Day, April 12, 1933.

### Franklin D. Roosevelt, Address on the Occasion of the Celebration of Pan-American Day, Washington, April 12, 1933

Source: Franklin D. Roosevelt and Foreign Policy, vol. I, Jan. 1933–Feb. 1934, ed. Edgar B. Nixon, The Belknap Press/Oxford University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts, 1969, pp. 19–21

I rejoice in this opportunity to participate in the celebration of "Pan-American Day" and to extend on behalf of the people of the United States a fraternal greeting to our sister American Republics. The celebration of "Pan-American Day" in this building, dedicated to international good-will and cooperation, exemplifies a unity of thought and purpose among the peoples of this hemisphere. It is a manifestation of the common ideal of mutual helpfulness, sympathetic understanding and spiritual solidarity.

There is inspiration in the thought that on this day the attention of the citizens of the twenty-one Republics of America is focused on the common ties – historical, cultural, economic, and social – which bind them to one another. Common ideals and a community of interest, together with a spirit of cooperation, have led to the realization that the well-being of one Nation depends in large measure upon the well-being of its neighbors. It is upon these foundations that Pan Americanism has been built.

This celebration commemorates a movement based upon the policy of fraternal cooperation. In my Inaugural Address I stated that I would "dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor – the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others – the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors." Never before has the significance of the words "good neighbor" been so manifest in international relations. Never have the need and benefit of neighborly cooperation in every form of human activity been so evident as they are today.

Friendship among Nations, as among individuals, calls for constructive efforts to muster the forces of humanity in order that an atmosphere of close understanding and cooperation may be cultivated. It involves mutual obligations and responsibilities, for it is only by sympathetic respect for the rights of others and a scrupulous fulfillment of the corresponding obligations by each member of the community that a true fraternity can be maintained.

The essential qualities of a true Pan Americanism must be the same as those which constitute a good neighbor, namely, mutual understanding, and, through such understanding, a sympathetic appreciation of the other's point of view. It is only in this manner that we can hope to build up a system of which confidence, friendship and good-will are the cornerstones.

In this spirit the people of every Republic on our continent are coming to a deep understanding of the fact that the Monroe Doctrine, of which so much has been written and spoken for more than a century, was and is directed at the maintenance of independence

by the peoples of the continent. It was aimed and is aimed against the acquisition in any manner of the control of additional territory in this hemisphere by any non-American power.

Hand in hand with this Pan-American doctrine of continental self-defense, the peoples of the American Republics understand more clearly, with the passing years, that the independence of each Republic must recognize the independence of every other Republic. Each one of us must grow by an advancement of civilization and social well-being and not by the acquisition of territory at the expense of any neighbor.

In this spirit of mutual understanding and of cooperation on this continent you and I cannot fail to be disturbed by any armed strife between neighbors. I do not hesitate to say to you, the distinguished members of the Governing Board of the Pan-American Union, that I regard existing conflicts between four of our sister Republics as a backward step.

Your Americanism and mine must be a structure built of confidence, cemented by a sympathy which recognizes only equality and fraternity. It finds its source and being in the hearts of men and dwells in the temple of the intellect.

We all of us have peculiar problems, and, to speak frankly, the interest of our own citizens must, in each instance, come first. But it is equally true that it is of vital importance to every Nation of this Continent that the American Governments, individually, take, without further delay, such action as may be possible to abolish all unnecessary and artificial barriers and restrictions which now hamper the healthy flow of trade between the peoples of the American Republics.

I am glad to deliver this message to you, Gentlemen of the Governing Board of the Pan-American Union, for I look upon the Union as the outward expression of the spiritual unity of the Americas. It is to this unity which must be courageous and vital in its element that humanity must look for one of the great stabilizing influences in world affairs.

In closing, may I refer to the ceremony which is to take place a little later in the morning at which the Government of Venezuela will present to the Pan-American Union the bust of a great American leader and patriot, Francisco de Miranda. I join with you in this tribute.

## The Anti-war Treaty of Non-aggression and Conciliation (Saavedra Lamas Treaty), October 10, 1933

One of the first examples of practical change and new opening in international relations in the Western Hemisphere was the signing of the Anti-war Treaty of Non-aggression and Conciliation at the conference in Rio de Janeiro on October 10, 1933. It is commonly known as Saavedra Lamas Treaty from the name of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Argentina who was its author.

The treaty condemned war as an instrument of foreign policy. Also it condemned any territorial changes as a result of military aggression. The Treaty introduced the rule

of amicable dispute resolution between the States. The most important statement of the Treaty is its Article 3 which condemns intervention by one State in the internal or external affairs of another State.

The Treaty was ratified by 20 States of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States. It was a great change in US Latin American policy as the previous American diplomacy strongly opposed any formal resignation from military intervention or any other form of intervention in internal affairs of Latin American countries. Later, the Treaty was also ratified by several European States. However, it does not prevent the use of military interventions as an instrument of foreign policy. The United States did not stop its interference in the internal affairs of Latin American States.

### Anti-war Treaty of Non-aggression and Conciliation (Saavedra Lamas Treaty), October 10, 1933

Source: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam01.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam01.asp) (26.09.2013)

The states designated below, in the desire to contribute to the consolidation of peace, and to express their adherence to the efforts made by all civilized nations to promote the spirit of universal harmony;

To the end of condemning wars of aggression and territorial acquisitions that may be obtained by armed conquest, making them impossible and establishing their invalidity through the positive provisions of this treaty, and in order to replace them with pacific solutions based on lofty concepts of justice and equity;

Convinced that one of the most effective means of assuring the moral and material benefits which peace offers to the world, is the organization of a permanent system of conciliation for international disputes, to be applied immediately on the violation of the principles mentioned;

Have decided to put these aims of non-aggression and concord in conventional form by concluding the present treaty, to which end they have appointed the undersigned plenipotentiaries, who, having exhibited their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following:

#### ARTICLE I

The high contracting parties solemnly declare that they condemn wars of aggression in their mutual relations or in those with other states, and that the settlement of disputes or controversies of any kind that may arise among them shall be effected only by the pacific means which have the sanction of international law.

#### ARTICLE II

They declare that as between the high contracting parties territorial questions must not be settled by violence, and that they will not recognize any territorial arrangement which is not obtained by pacific means, nor the validity of the occupation or acquisition of territories that may be brought about by force of arms.

#### ARTICLE III

In case of noncompliance, by any state engaged in a dispute, with the obligations contained in the foregoing articles, the contracting states undertake to make every effort for



the maintenance of peace. To that end they will adopt in their character as neutrals a common and solidary attitude; they will exercise the political, juridical, or economic means authorized by international law; they will bring the influence of public opinion to bear, but will in no case resort to intervention, either diplomatic or armed; subject to the attitude that may be incumbent on them by virtue of other collective treaties to which such states are signatories.

#### ARTICLE IV

The high contracting parties obligate themselves to submit to the conciliation procedure established by this treaty the disputes specially mentioned and any others that may arise in their reciprocal relations, without further limitations than those enumerated in the following article, in all controversies which it has not been possible to settle by diplomatic means within a reasonable period of time.

#### ARTICLE V

The high contracting parties and the states which may in the future adhere to this treaty may not formulate, at the time of signature, ratification, or adherence, other limitations to the conciliation procedure than those which are indicated below:

(a) Differences for the solution of which treaties, conventions, pacts, or pacific agreements of any kind whatever may have been concluded, which in no case shall be considered as annulled by this agreement, but supplemented thereby insofar as they tend to assure peace; as well as the questions or matters settled by previous treaties;

(b) Disputes which the parties prefer to solve by direct settlement or submit by common agreement to an arbitral or judicial solution;

(c) Questions which international law leaves to the exclusive competence of each state, under its constitutional system, for which reason the parties may object to their being submitted to the conciliation procedure before the national or local jurisdiction has decided definitively; except in the case of manifest denial or delay of justice, in which case the conciliation procedure shall be initiated within a year at the latest;

(d) Matters which affect constitutional precepts of the parties to the controversy. In case of doubt, each party shall obtain the reasoned opinion of its respective tribunal or supreme court of justice, if the latter should be invested with such powers.

The high contracting parties may communicate, at any time and in the manner provided for by article XV, an instrument stating that they have abandoned wholly or in part the limitations established by them in the conciliation procedure.

The effect of the limitations formulated by one of the contracting parties shall be that the other parties shall not consider themselves obligated in regard to that party save in the measure of the exceptions established.

#### ARTICLE VI

In the absence of a permanent conciliation commission or of some other international organization charged with this mission by virtue of previous treaties in effect, the high contracting parties undertake to submit their differences to the examination and investigation of a conciliation commission which shall be formed as follows, unless there is an agreement to the contrary of the parties in each case:

The conciliation commission shall consist of five members. Each party to the controversy shall designate a member, who may be chosen by it from among its own nationals. The three remaining members shall be designated by common agreement by the parties from among the nationals of third powers, who must be of different nationalities, must not have their customary residence in the territory of the interested parties, nor be in the service of any of them. The parties shall choose the president of the conciliation commission from among the said three members.

If they cannot arrive at an agreement with regard to such designations, they may entrust the selection thereof to a third power or to some other existing international organism. If the candidates so designated are rejected by the parties or by any one of them, each party shall present a list of candidates equal in number to that of the members to be selected, and the names of those to sit on the conciliation commission shall be determined by lot.

#### ARTICLE VII

The tribunals or supreme courts of justice which, in accordance with the domestic legislation of each state, may be competent to interpret, in the last or the sole instance and in matters under their respective jurisdiction, the constitution, treaties, or the general principles of the law of nations, may be designated preferentially by the high contracting parties to discharge the duties entrusted by the present treaty to the conciliation commission. In this case the tribunal or court may function as a whole or may designate some of its members to proceed alone or by forming a mixed commission with members of other courts or tribunals, as may be agreed upon by common accord between the parties to the dispute.

#### ARTICLE VIII

The conciliation commission shall establish its own rules of procedure, which shall provide in all cases for hearing both sides.

The parties to the controversy may furnish, and the commission may require from them, all the antecedents and information necessary. The parties may have themselves represented by delegates and assisted by advisers or experts, and also present evidence of all kinds.

(...)

#### ARTICLE X

It is the duty of the commission to secure the conciliatory settlement of the disputes submitted to its consideration.

After an impartial study of the questions in dispute, it shall set forth in a report the outcome of its work and shall propose to the parties bases of settlement by means of a just and equitable solution.

The report of the commission shall in no case have the character of a final decision or arbitral award either with respect to the exposition or interpretation of the facts, or with regard to the considerations or conclusions of law.

(...)

## 7<sup>th</sup> International Conference of American States, Montevideo, December 26, 1933

It used to be said that the 7<sup>th</sup> International Conference of American States held in Montevideo, Uruguay, in December 1933 was the greatest moment of Pan American

movement and the good neighbor policy. During the Montevideo Conference, Latin American countries and the United States signed several important conventions. Undoubtedly the most important one was the *Convention on Rights and Duties of the States*, signed on December 26, 1933. Among its most crucial provisions were those about the equality of the States meaning that the rights of the States are inviolable. However, Article 8 is commonly perceived as a milestone in the inter-American relations and a fundamental change in US Latin American policy. It stated very briefly that “no state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another.”

The Convention was the last of a long series of efforts of Latin American countries to convince the United States to resign from military intervention as an instrument of their foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere. As Franklin D. Roosevelt was determined to change US Latin American policy, the acceptance of the Latin American proposition of resignation from intervention in the internal affairs of other States seemed to be the best occasion to prove that the good neighbor policy is not only imagined but a real new form of US relations with its southern neighbors.

## Convention on Rights and Duties of States (Inter-American), December 26, 1933

Source: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam03.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam03.asp) (26.09.2013)

### ARTICLE 1

The state as a person of international law should possess the following qualifications: a) a permanent population; b) a defined territory; c) government; and d) capacity to enter into relations with the other states.

### ARTICLE 2

The federal state shall constitute a sole person in the eyes of international law.

### ARTICLE 3

The political existence of the state is independent of recognition by the other states. Even before recognition the state has the right to defend its integrity and independence, to provide for its conservation and prosperity, and consequently to organize itself as it sees fit, to legislate upon its interests, administer its services, and to define the jurisdiction and competence of its courts.

The exercise of these rights has no other limitation than the exercise of the rights of other states according to international law.

### ARTICLE 4

States are juridically equal, enjoy the same rights, and have equal capacity in their exercise. The rights of each one do not depend upon the power which it possesses to assure its exercise, but upon the simple fact of its existence as a person under international law.

### ARTICLE 5

The fundamental rights of states are not susceptible of being affected in any manner whatsoever.

## ARTICLE 6

The recognition of a state merely signifies that the state which recognizes it accepts the personality of the other with all the rights and duties determined by international law. Recognition is unconditional and irrevocable.

## ARTICLE 7

The recognition of a state may be express or tacit. The latter results from any act which implies the intention of recognizing the new state.

## ARTICLE 8

No state has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another.

## ARTICLE 9

The jurisdiction of states within the limits of national territory applies to all the inhabitants.

Nationals and foreigners are under the same protection of the law and the national authorities and the foreigners may not claim rights other or more extensive than those of the nationals.

## ARTICLE 10

The primary interest of states is the conservation of peace. Differences of any nature which arise between them should be settled by recognized pacific methods.

## ARTICLE 11

The contracting states definitely establish as the rule of their conduct the precise obligation not to recognize territorial acquisitions or special advantages which have been obtained by force whether this consists in the employment of arms, in threatening diplomatic representations, or in any other effective coercive measure. The territory of a state is inviolable and may not be the object of military occupation nor of other measures of force imposed by another state directly or indirectly or for any motive whatever even temporarily.

## ARTICLE 12

The present Convention shall not affect obligations previously entered into by the High Contracting Parties by virtue of international agreements.

## ARTICLE 13

The present Convention shall be ratified by the High Contracting Parties in conformity with their respective constitutional procedures. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Uruguay shall transmit authentic certified copies to the governments for the aforementioned purpose of ratification. The instrument of ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Pan American Union in Washington, which shall notify the signatory governments of said deposit. Such notification shall be considered as an exchange of ratifications.

## ARTICLE 14

The present Convention will enter into force between the High Contracting Parties in the order in which they deposit their respective ratifications.

## ARTICLE 15

The present Convention shall remain in force indefinitely but may be denounced by means of one year's notice given to the Pan American Union, which shall transmit it to the other signatory governments. After the expiration of this period the Convention shall cease in its effects as regards the party which denounces but shall remain in effect for the remaining High Contracting Parties.

## ARTICLE 16

The present Convention shall be open for the adherence and accession of the States which are not signatories. The corresponding instruments shall be deposited in the archives of the Pan American Union which shall communicate them to the other High Contracting Parties.

In witness whereof, the following Plenipotentiaries have signed this Convention in Spanish, English, Portuguese and French and hereunto affix their respective seals in the city of Montevideo, Republic of Uruguay, this 26<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1933.

## RESERVATIONS

The Delegation of the United States of America, in signing the Convention on the Rights and Duties of States, does so with the express reservation presented to the Plenary Session of the Conference on December 22, 1933, which reservation reads as follows:

The Delegation of the United States, in voting "yes" on the final vote on this committee recommendation and proposal, makes the same reservation to the eleven articles of the project or proposal that the United States Delegation made to the first ten articles during the final vote in the full Commission, which reservation is in words as follows:

"The policy and attitude of the United States Government toward every important phase of international relationships in this hemisphere could scarcely be made more clear and definite than they have been made by both word and action especially since March 4. I [Secretary of State Cordell Hull, chairman of U.S. delegation] have no disposition therefore to indulge in any repetition or rehearsal of these acts and utterances and shall not do so. Every observing person must by this time thoroughly understand that under the Roosevelt Administration the United States Government is as much opposed as any other government to interference with the freedom, the sovereignty, or other internal affairs or processes of the governments of other nations."

"In addition to numerous acts and utterances in connection with the carrying out of these doctrines and policies, President Roosevelt, during recent weeks, gave out a public statement expressing his disposition to open negotiations with the Cuban Government for the purpose of dealing with the treaty which has existed since 1903. I feel safe in undertaking to say that under our support of the general principle of non-intervention as has been suggested, no government need fear any intervention on the part of the United States under the Roosevelt Administration. I think it unfortunate that during the brief period of this Conference there is apparently not time within which to prepare interpretations and definitions of these fundamental terms that are embraced in the report. Such definitions and interpretations would enable every government to proceed in a uniform way without any difference of opinion or of interpretations. I hope that at the earliest possible date such very important work will be done. In the meantime in case of differences of interpretations and also until they (the proposed doctrines and principles) can be worked out and codified for the common use of every government, I desire to say that the United States Government in all of its international associations and relationships and conduct will follow scrupulously the doctrines and policies which it has pursued since March 4 which are embodied in the different addresses of President Roosevelt since that time and in the recent peace address of myself on the 15<sup>th</sup> day of December before this Conference and in the law of nations as generally recognized and accepted."

The delegates of Brazil and Peru recorded the following private vote with regard to article 11: "That they accept the doctrine in principle but that they do not consider it codifiable because there are some countries which have not yet signed the Anti-War Pact of Rio de Janeiro 4 of which this doctrine is a part and therefore it does not yet constitute positive international law suitable for codification."

## Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation, December 21, 1936

After the great success in the form of the *Convention on Rights and Duties of States* the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt continued its Latin American policy in a new form and using a broad spectrum of foreign policy instruments, excluding military intervention. It was the effect of a deep conviction of the President that friendly relations with other countries of the Western Hemisphere could bring more positive effects to the United States, especially in the difficult time of the 1930s. It was the decade of the Great Depression and the US administration had to concentrate on the internal economic problems. For this it needed good relations with the nearest neighbors and it was not looking for any conflicts and disputes. Also, it was a time of growing disturbances in Europe and Asia. The international relations were more and more hostile and FDR knew that it is very important to have friendly relations with all the Latin American countries. Only this situation could help the United States assure its security in the region and to gain benefits with the economic cooperation with particular countries.

The effect of this kind of US policy was FDR's proposition submitted to all the Latin American countries of holding a conference that would help strengthen the hemispheric cooperation in the situation of growing conflicts in international relations. The proposition was broadly accepted and all the Latin American countries participated in the *Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires from 3–23 December, 1936*. *It was one of the very few inter-American conferences during which the US President received a warm welcome. The result of the conference in Buenos Aires was adoption of the Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation*. It referred to values common for all countries of the Western Hemisphere such as a democratic form of government, desire for peace and justice. In a separate convention the States underlined the rule of consultations as a proper instrument for solving any conflicts between the States. Another time the signatories underlined the rule of non-intervention.

Declaration of Principles of Inter-American Solidarity and Cooperation, Buenos Aires, December 21, 1936

Source: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam07.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam07.asp) (26.09.2013)

The Governments of the American Republics, having considered:

That they have a common likeness in their democratic form of government and their common ideals of peace and justice, manifested in the several Treaties and Conventions which they have signed for the purpose of constituting a purely American system tending towards the preservation of peace, the proscription of war, the harmonious development

of their commerce and of their cultural aspirations in the various fields of political, economic, social, scientific and artistic activities;

That the existence of continental interests obliges them to maintain solidarity of principles as the basis of the life of the relations of each to every other American nation;

That Pan Americanism, as a principle of American International Law, by which is understood a moral union of all of the American Republics in defence of their common interests based upon the most perfect equality and reciprocal respect for their rights of autonomy, independence and free development, requires the proclamation of principles of American International Law; and

That it is necessary to consecrate the principle of American solidarity in all non-continental conflicts, especially since those limited to the American Continent should find a peaceful solution by the means established by the Treaties and Conventions now in force or in the instruments hereafter to be executed.

The Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace

**DECLARES:**

1. That the American Nations, true to their republican institutions, proclaim their absolute juridical liberty, their unqualified respect for their respective sovereignties and the existence of a common democracy throughout America;

2. That every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and every one of them, and justifies the initiation of the procedure of consultation provided for in the Convention for the Maintenance, Preservation and Reestablishment of Peace, signed at this Conference; and

3. That the following principles are accepted by the American community of Nations:

(a) Proscription of territorial conquest and that, in consequence, no acquisition made through violence shall be recognized;

(b) Intervention by one State in the internal or external affairs of another State is condemned;

(c) Forcible collection of pecuniary debts is illegal; and

(d) Any difference or dispute between the American nations, whatever its nature or origin, shall be settled by the methods of conciliation, or unrestricted arbitration, or through operation of international justice.





## Chapter Six

# Inter-American System

The end of World War II was a time of deep uncertainty in the Western Hemisphere. The construction of the new world order that had already started in the last months of the war was constructing without Latin American participation. The US's position in global international relations had changed significantly. It was ending the war as one of the two superpowers. Its economy was developing in a very dynamic way and even its transition to peace did not stop its growth. The use of a nuclear bomb in Japan made the United States a military superpower. And the leading role in the alliance against The Axis States ensured the United States a dominant position in international politics. Meanwhile the international position of the Latin American countries did not change significantly. The most important change took place in the economy as a period of World War II was a time of huge demand for raw materials and agricultural products from the region. It produced a rapid growth of Latin American economies. However, to make this situation constant it was necessary to cooperate with the United States. Latin American leaders hoped that the good neighbor policy that flourished in the 1930s would continue after the world war.

Since the last years of World War II, Latin American leaders had been trying to gain US attention to the hemispheric cooperation. However, the US point of view had already changed. It was not the economy that was the most important subject of international relations for the United States. Security became the priority. And with the explosion of ideological competition with the Soviet Union, it was the containment of communist ideology that defined US foreign policy, also in the Western Hemisphere. Latin American leaders were convinced that the Pan American system is the most proper one for continuing cooperation with 'the colossus from the north.' However, the new world order based on the new global organization – the United Nations – and the US desire to dominate forced Latin American countries to accept the reformulation of the basis of hemispheric cooperation. Although it accepted the entire heritage of Pan Americanism, the new realities and the new role of the United States in global international relations had changed the nature of cooperation between the United States and Latin American countries. The security priority in the US foreign policy became somewhat of an obsession and American authorities were ready to use all instruments of foreign policy to ensure national security. This meant that the United States went back to the unilateral policy in the Western Hemisphere. To reach this goal, they did not exclude military intervention. In the first years of the Cold War it was indirect intervention – the overthrow of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala – and in the next decades it was also direct military intervention

as it was in the case of the Bay of Pigs, Dominican Republic, Grenada, and Panama. It can be concluded that the Cold War changed the nature of US-Latin American relations. The new frames of these relations were formulated during the 1950s and were modified in the next decades.

## The Act of Chapultepec, March 6, 1945

The eruption of World War II in 1939 was a factor that moved Pan American cooperation to the back burner in the US foreign policy. Particularly, after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and the entrance of the United States into the war, the center of US international interest moved to Europe and Pacific. It was natural that Latin America lost its important position in US foreign affairs. However, already in the war years, American diplomacy took up some efforts to ensure support for Latin American countries both during the war and after its conclusion during the process of creating a postwar order.

As there was no doubt that the new order after the World War II would be different from the one that was previously dominated, Latin American countries were strongly interested in the participation in its formation. This is why they were interested in cooperation with the United States. Also, Latin America expected the new order to help it maintain its economic prosperity of war years. The maintenance of strong US economic engagement in the region would constitute a solid foundation of economic development of the Latin American countries. This is why Latin American leaders were strongly interested in organizing a special meeting of all members of the Pan American movement to discuss the possible scenarios for postwar cooperation. That meeting was held in Mexico City between February 21 and March 8, 1945. The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace adopted the *Resolution of Reciprocal Assistance and the American Solidarity*, commonly known as the *Act of Chapultepec* on March 6. The main dispute during the conference related to the form of the postwar order. Latin American leaders were afraid of the predominant position of the great superpowers in the international system. Their main preoccupation was that this solution would marginalize the other countries and regions. The American delegation was trying to persuade its southern neighbors that the new order based on the domination of the world's greatest powers is the only possibility to protect against such a tragedy as a world war. Although the differences in opinions and visions among Latin Americans and US diplomacy were significant, the soul of cooperation from the years of the good neighbor policy was still present during the conference. The effect of this mutual cooperation and confidence was the resolution adopted during the meeting. The *Resolution of Reciprocal Assistance and American Solidarity* is the confirmation of the previous heritage of the Pan American cooperation. This was especially important for the leaders of Latin American countries, as this heritage was based on the equality of States, cooperation and non-intervention.

Including this kind of basic rules into the Resolution gave hope that the new order will also be based on the same values and rules. After the confirmation of the Pan American achievements, the signatories expressed their will to construct a new form of hemispheric cooperation that would be more suitable for the postwar order. To do so, the signatories of the Act of Chapultepec obliged representatives of their States to prepare new treaties that would regard the problems of the new international order and to formulate a new regional security system.

## Inter-American Reciprocal Assistance and Solidarity (Act of Chapultepec), March 6, 1945

Source: *The Dynamics of World Power. A Documentary History of United States Foreign Policy, 1945–1973*, vol. VIII Latin America, ed. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., Chelsea House Publishers, New York, 1973, pp. 3–10

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/chapul.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/chapul.asp) (08.10.2013)

### RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE AND AMERICAN SOLIDARITY

#### WHEREAS:

The peoples of the Americas, animated by a profound love of justice, remain sincerely devoted to the principles of international law.

It is their desire that such principles, notwithstanding the present difficult circumstances, prevail with even greater force in future international relations.

The inter-American conferences have repeatedly proclaimed certain fundamental principles, but these must be reaffirmed at a time when the juridical bases of the community of nations are being re-established.

The new situation in the world makes more imperative than ever the union and solidarity of the American peoples, for the defense of their rights and the maintenance of international peace.

The American states have been incorporating in their international law, since 1890, by means of conventions, resolutions and declarations, the following principles:

- a) The proscription of territorial conquest and the non-recognition of all acquisitions made by force (First International Conference of American States, 1890);
- b) The condemnation of intervention by one State in the internal or external affairs of another (Seventh International Conference of American States, 1933, and Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);
- c) The recognition that every war or threat of war affects directly or indirectly all civilized peoples, and endangers the great principles of liberty and justice which constitute the American ideal and the standard of American international policy (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);
- d) The system of mutual consultation in order to find means of peaceful cooperation in the event of war or threat of war between American countries (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

e) The recognition that every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and every one of the American nations and justifies the initiation of the procedure of consultation (Inter-American Conference for: the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

f) The adoption of conciliation, unrestricted arbitration, or the application of international justice, in the solution of any difference or dispute between American nations, whatever its nature or origin (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

g) The recognition that respect for the personality, sovereignty and independence of each American State constitutes the essence of international order sustained by continental solidarity, which historically has been expressed and sustained by declarations and treaties in force (Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

h) The affirmation that respect for and the faithful observance of treaties constitute the indispensable rule for the development of peaceful relations between States, and that treaties can only be revised by agreement of the contracting parties (Declaration of American Principles, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

i) The proclamation that, in case the peace, security or territorial integrity of any American republic is threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coordinating their respective sovereign wills by means of the procedure of consultation, using the measures which in each case the circumstances may make advisable (Declaration of Lima, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

j) The declaration that any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American State shall be considered as an act of aggression against all the American States (Declaration XV of the Second Meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Habana, 1940).

The furtherance of these principles, which the American States have constantly practiced in order to assure peace and solidarity among the nations of the Continent, constitutes an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment.

The security and solidarity of the Continent are affected to the same extent by an act of aggression against any of the American States by a non-American State, as by an act of aggression of an American State against one or more American States.

## **PART I**

The Governments Represented at the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace

### **DECLARE:**

1. That all sovereign States are juridically equal among themselves.
2. That every State has the right to the respect of its individuality and independence, on the part of the other members of the international community.
3. That every attack of a State against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State, shall, conformably to Part III hereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other States which sign this Act. In any case invasion by armed forces of one State into the territory of another trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith shall constitute an act of aggression.
4. That in case acts of aggression occur or there are reasons to believe that an aggression is being prepared by any other State against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State, the

States signatory to this Act will consult among themselves in order to agree upon the measures it may be advisable to take.

5. That during the war, and until the treaty recommended in Part II hereof is concluded, the signatories of this Act recognize that such threats and acts of aggression, as indicated in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, constitute an interference with the war effort of the United Nations, calling for such procedures, within the scope of their constitutional powers of a general nature and for war, as may be found necessary, including: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radio-telephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

6. That the principles and procedure contained in this Declaration shall become effective immediately, inasmuch as any act of aggression or threat of aggression during the present state of war interferes with the war effort of the United Nations to obtain victory. Henceforth, and to the end that the principles and procedures herein stipulated shall conform with the constitutional processes of each Republic, the respective Governments shall take the necessary steps to perfect this instrument in order that it shall be in force at all times.

## **PART II**

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace

### **RECOMMENDS:**

That for the purpose of meeting threats or acts of aggression against any American Republic following the establishment of peace, the Governments of the American Republics consider the conclusion, in accordance with their constitutional processes, of a treaty establishing procedures whereby such threats or acts may be met by the use, by all or some of the signatories of said treaty, of any one or more of the following measures: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radio-telephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

## **PART III**

The above Declaration and Recommendation constitute a regional arrangement for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action in this Hemisphere. The said arrangement, and the pertinent activities and procedures, shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization, when established.

This agreement shall be known as the "Act of Chapultepec."

[The final act of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace was signed on March 8, 1945, by delegates representing Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela.]

## The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, September 2, 1947

Although recommendations adopted during the conference in Mexico City called for the establishment of a regional security system in short time, it took more than two years to complete this task. The main obstacle was a strong conflict between the United States and Argentina which was the consequence of Argentina's soft policy toward Germany. It was the last country that declared war on the Third Reich on March 28, 1945. Due to the sharp relations between the governments of the United States and Argentina, the latter did not participate in the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace in Mexico City in 1945. The bilateral relations between both countries improved after the electoral victory of Juan D. Perón in 1946. In consequence, the United States approved Argentinean participation in the works over the construction of new inter-American cooperation system. In August 1947, a conference dedicated to the subject of regional security was inaugurated near Rio de Janeiro. The effect of this conference was the *Inter-American Treaty on Reciprocal Assistance* – TIAR, called the Rio Treaty.

The Rio Treaty became the first foundation of the new inter-American system constructed in the Western Hemisphere after World War II. It constituted the first system of regional security created in accordance with the United Nations Charter. The most important rule of this system is expressed in Article 3 that discusses reciprocal assistance in the event of an armed attack on one of the signatories of the Treaty. However, the Treaty also involved some controversial statements, as for example aggression that is not an armed attack. In later years, the United States used this statement to interfere in the internal affairs of the Latin American states. Also, the Treaty enumerates the methods of action that signatories can undertake in the event of aggression. The possibility of using military force is included among them, although, according to the Treaty, none of the States can be forced to use military force against its will. The Rio Treaty did not form joint military units or a common institutional organization. It mentioned an Organ of Consultation as an executive body of the Treaty. In practice, this role falls on the Council of the Organization of American States.

The Rio Treaty, as the first treaty in the world that constituted a regional system of security, became a model for other such alliances, with the most important of them, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

### Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, September 2, 1947

Source: *The Dynamics of World Power. A Documentary History of United States Foreign Policy, 1945–1973*, vol. VIII Latin America, ed. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., Chelsea House Publishers, New York, 1973, pp. 30–35

<http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/treaties/b-29.html> (08.10.2013)

In the name of their Peoples, the Governments represented at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security, desirous of consolidating and strengthening their relations of friendship and good neighborliness, and

**Considering:**

That Resolution VIII of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, which met in Mexico City, recommended the conclusion of a treaty to prevent and repel threats and acts of aggression against any of the countries of America;

That the High Contracting Parties reiterate their will to remain united in an inter-American system consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations, and reaffirm the existence of the agreement which they have concluded concerning those matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which are appropriate for regional action;

That the High Contracting Parties reaffirm their adherence to the principles of inter-American solidarity and cooperation, and especially to those set forth in the preamble and declarations of the Act of Chapultepec, all of which should be understood to be accepted as standards of their mutual relations and as the juridical basis of the Inter-American System;

That the American States propose, in order to improve the procedures for the pacific settlement of their controversies, to conclude the treaty concerning the "Inter-American Peace System" envisaged in Resolutions IX and XXXIX of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace,

That the obligation of mutual assistance and common defense of the American Republics is essentially related to their democratic ideals and to their will to cooperate permanently in the fulfillment of the principles and purposes of a policy of peace;

That the American regional community affirms as a manifest truth that juridical organization is a necessary prerequisite of security and peace, and that peace is founded on justice and moral order and, consequently, on the international recognition and protection of human rights and freedoms, on the indispensable well-being of the people, and on the effectiveness of democracy for the international realization of justice and security,

Have resolved, in conformity with the objectives stated above, to conclude the following Treaty, in order to assure peace, through adequate means, to provide for effective reciprocal assistance to meet armed attacks against any American State, and in order to deal with threats of aggression against any of them:

**ARTICLE 1**

The High Contracting Parties formally condemn war and undertake in their international relations not to resort to the threat or the use of force in any manner inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations or of this Treaty.

**ARTICLE 2**

As a consequence of the principle set forth in the preceding Article, the High Contracting Parties undertake to submit every controversy which may arise between them to methods of peaceful settlement and to endeavor to settle any such controversy among themselves by means of the procedures in force in the Inter-American System before referring it to the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations.

**ARTICLE 3**

1. The High Contracting Parties agree that an armed attack by any State against an American State shall be considered as an attack against all the American States and, consequently, each one of the said Contracting Parties undertakes to assist in meeting the attack in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. On the request of the State or States directly attacked and until the decision of the Organ of Consultation of the Inter-American System, each one of the Contracting Parties may determine the immediate measures which it may individually take in fulfillment of the obligation contained in the preceding paragraph and in accordance with the principle of continental solidarity. The Organ of Consultation shall meet without delay for the purpose of examining those measures and agreeing upon the measures of a collective character that should be taken.

3. The provisions of this Article shall be applied in case of any armed attack which takes place within the region described in Article 4 or within the territory of an American State. When the attack takes place outside of the said areas, the provisions of Article 6 shall be applied.

4. Measures of self-defense provided for under this Article may be taken until the Security Council of the United Nations has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

#### **ARTICLE 4**

The region to which this Treaty refers is bounded as follows: beginning at the North Pole; thence due south to a point 74 degrees north latitude, 10 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 47 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, 50 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 35 degrees north latitude, 60 degrees west longitude; thence due south to a point in 20 degrees north latitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 5 degrees north latitude, 24 degrees west longitude; thence due south to the South Pole; thence due north to a point 30 degrees south latitude, 90 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point on the Equator at 97 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 15 degrees north latitude, 120 degrees west longitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 50 degrees north latitude, 170 degrees east longitude; thence due north to a point in 54 degrees north latitude; thence by a rhumb line to a point 65 degrees 30 minutes north latitude, 168 degrees 58 minutes 5 seconds west longitude: thence due north to the North Pole.

#### **ARTICLE 5**

The High Contracting Parties shall immediately send to the Security Council of the United Nations, in conformity with Articles 51 and 54 of the Charter of the United Nations, complete information concerning the activities undertaken or in contemplation in the exercise of the right of self-defense or for the purpose of maintaining inter-American peace and security.

#### **ARTICLE 6**

If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extra-continental or intra-continental conflict, or by any other fact or situation might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the Continent.

(...)

#### **ARTICLE 8**

For the purposes of this Treaty, the measures on which the Organ of Consultation may agree will comprise one or more of the following: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed force.



**ARTICLE 9**

In addition to other acts which the Organ of Consultation may characterize as aggression, the following shall be considered as such:

- a. Unprovoked armed attack by a State against the territory, the people, or the land, sea or air forces of another State;
- b. Invasion, by the armed forces of a State, of the territory of an American State, through the trespassing of boundaries demarcated in accordance with a treaty, judicial decision, or arbitral award, or, in the absence of frontiers thus demarcated, invasion affecting a region which is under the effective jurisdiction of another State.

(...)

**ARTICLE 12**

The Governing Board of the Pan American Union may act provisionally as an organ of consultation until the meeting of the Organ of Consultation referred to in the preceding Article takes place.

(...)

**ARTICLE 26**

The principles and fundamental provisions of this Treaty shall be incorporated in the Organic Pact of the Inter-American System.

(...)

## The Charter of the Organization of American States, April 30, 1948

As the Rio Treaty was the first element of the new inter-American system that was creating after the end of the World War II, the second was the Charter of the Organization of American States. This document was signed during the 9<sup>th</sup> International Conference of American States in Bogota. The Conference took place between March 30 and May 2, 1948. Despite debating in dramatic circumstances, as fierce demonstrations erupted in the Colombian capital, the leaders of 21 countries brought a new regional organization into existence during the Conference. The previously existing Union of American Republics was replaced by the new Organization of American States.

The works on the statute of the new organization lasted from 1945 as it was recommended by the participants of the conference in Mexico City – Chapultepec. However, the controversies between Latin American leaders and the United States were so big that it took several years to create a final version. As most Latin Americans were afraid of the growing predominance of the North American superpower, they specifically insisted on the rule of sovereignty and independence of equal states of the Western Hemisphere.

The Charter of the Organization of American States was amended four times, in 1967, 1985, 1992 and 1993. There were also a lot of reforms and changes of conventions, declarations and regulations related to the various form of the OAS activity and its institutional structure.

## Charter of the Organization of American States, April 30, 1948

Source: *The Dynamics of World Power. A Documentary History of United States Foreign Policy, 1945–1973*, vol. VIII Latin America, ed. Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., Chelsea House Publishers, New York, 1973, pp. 49–70

[http://www.oas.org/dil/treaties\\_A-41\\_Charter\\_of\\_the\\_Organization\\_of\\_American\\_States.htm](http://www.oas.org/dil/treaties_A-41_Charter_of_the_Organization_of_American_States.htm) (08.10.2013)

IN THE NAME OF THEIR PEOPLES, THE STATES REPRESENTED AT THE NINTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN STATES,

Convinced that the historic mission of America is to offer to man a land of liberty and a favorable environment for the development of his personality and the realization of his just aspirations;

Conscious that that mission has already inspired numerous agreements, whose essential value lies in the desire of the American peoples to live together in peace and, through their mutual understanding and respect for the sovereignty of each one, to provide for the betterment of all, in independence, in equality and under law;

Convinced that representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace and development of the region;

Confident that the true significance of American solidarity and good neighborliness can only mean the consolidation on this continent, within the framework of democratic institutions, of a system of individual liberty and social justice based on respect for the essential rights of man;

Persuaded that their welfare and their contribution to the progress and the civilization of the world will increasingly require intensive continental cooperation;

Resolved to persevere in the noble undertaking that humanity has conferred upon the United Nations, whose principles and purposes they solemnly reaffirm;

Convinced that juridical organization is a necessary condition for security and peace founded on moral order and on justice; and

In accordance with Resolution IX of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, held in Mexico City,

HAVE AGREED upon the following

CHARTER OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

## **Part One**

### **Chapter I**

#### **NATURE AND PURPOSES**

##### **Article 1**

The American States establish by this Charter the international organization that they have developed to achieve an order of peace and justice, to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence. Within the United Nations, the Organization of American States is a regional agency.

The Organization of American States has no powers other than those expressly conferred upon it by this Charter, none of whose provisions authorizes it to intervene in matters that are within the internal jurisdiction of the Member States.

##### **Article 2**

The Organization of American States, in order to put into practice the principles on which it is founded and to fulfill its regional obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, proclaims the following essential purposes:

- a) To strengthen the peace and security of the continent;
- b) To promote and consolidate representative democracy, with due respect for the principle of nonintervention;
- c) To prevent possible causes of difficulties and to ensure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the Member States;
- d) To provide for common action on the part of those States in the event of aggression;
- e) To seek the solution of political, juridical, and economic problems that may arise among them;
- f) To promote, by cooperative action, their economic, social, and cultural development;
- g) To eradicate extreme poverty, which constitutes an obstacle to the full democratic development of the peoples of the hemisphere; and
- h) To achieve an effective limitation of conventional weapons that will make it possible to devote the largest amount of resources to the economic and social development of the Member States.

### **Chapter II**

#### **PRINCIPLES**

##### **Article 3**

The American States reaffirm the following principles:

- a) International law is the standard of conduct of States in their reciprocal relations;
- b) International order consists essentially of respect for the personality, sovereignty, and independence of States, and the faithful fulfillment of obligations derived from treaties and other sources of international law;
- c) Good faith shall govern the relations between States;
- d) The solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those States on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy;

- e) Every State has the right to choose, without external interference, its political, economic, and social system and to organize itself in the way best suited to it, and has the duty to abstain from intervening in the affairs of another State. Subject to the foregoing, the American States shall cooperate fully among themselves, independently of the nature of their political, economic, and social systems;
- f) The elimination of extreme poverty is an essential part of the promotion and consolidation of representative democracy and is the common and shared responsibility of the American States;
- g) The American States condemn war of aggression: victory does not give rights;
- h) An act of aggression against one American State is an act of aggression against all the other American States;
- i) Controversies of an international character arising between two or more American States shall be settled by peaceful procedures;
- j) Social justice and social security are bases of lasting peace;
- k) Economic cooperation is essential to the common welfare and prosperity of the peoples of the continent;
- l) The American States proclaim the fundamental rights of the individual without distinction as to race, nationality, creed, or sex;
- m) The spiritual unity of the continent is based on respect for the cultural values of the American countries and requires their close cooperation for the high purposes of civilization;
- n) The education of peoples should be directed toward justice, freedom, and peace.

### **Chapter III**

#### **MEMBERS**

##### **Article 4**

All American States that ratify the present Charter are Members of the Organization.

##### **Article 5**

Any new political entity that arises from the union of several Member States and that, as such, ratifies the present Charter, shall become a Member of the Organization. The entry of the new political entity into the Organization shall result in the loss of membership of each one of the States which constitute it

##### **Article 6**

Any other independent American State that desires to become a Member of the Organization should so indicate by means of a note addressed to the Secretary General, in which it declares that it is willing to sign and ratify the Charter of the Organization and to accept all the obligations inherent in membership, especially those relating to collective security expressly set forth in Articles 28 and 29 of the Charter.

##### **Article 7**

The General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Permanent Council of the Organization, shall determine whether it is appropriate that the Secretary General be authorized to permit the applicant State to sign the Charter and to accept the deposit of the corresponding instrument of ratification. Both the recommendation of the Permanent Council and the decision of the General Assembly shall require the affirmative vote of two thirds of the Member States.

### **Article 8**

Membership in the Organization shall be confined to independent States of the Hemisphere that were Members of the United Nations as of December 10, 1985, and the non autonomous territories mentioned in document OEA/Ser. P, AG/doc.1939/85, of November 5, 1985, when they become independent.

### **Article 9**

A Member of the Organization whose democratically constituted government has been overthrown by force may be suspended from the exercise of the right to participate in the sessions of the General Assembly, the Meeting of Consultation, the Councils of the Organization and the Specialized Conferences as well as in the commissions, working groups and any other bodies established.

- a) The power to suspend shall be exercised only when such diplomatic initiatives undertaken by the Organization for the purpose of promoting the restoration of representative democracy in the affected Member State have been unsuccessful;
- b) The decision to suspend shall be adopted at a special session of the General Assembly by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Member States;
- c) The suspension shall take effect immediately following its approval by the General Assembly;
- d) The suspension notwithstanding, the Organization shall endeavor to undertake additional diplomatic initiatives to contribute to the re-establishment of representative democracy in the affected Member State;
- e) The Member which has been subject to suspension shall continue to fulfill its obligations to the Organization;
- f) The General Assembly may lift the suspension by a decision adopted with the approval of two-thirds of the Member States;
- g) The powers referred to in this article shall be exercised in accordance with this Charter.

## **Chapter IV**

### **FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF STATES**

#### **Article 10**

States are juridically equal, enjoy equal rights and equal capacity to exercise these rights, and have equal duties. The rights of each State depend not upon its power to ensure the exercise thereof, but upon the mere fact of its existence as a person under international law.

#### **Article 11**

Every American State has the duty to respect the rights enjoyed by every other State in accordance with international law.

#### **Article 12**

The fundamental rights of States may not be impaired in any manner whatsoever.

#### **Article 13**

The political existence of the State is independent of recognition by other States. Even before being recognized, the State has the right to defend its integrity and independence, to provide for its preservation and prosperity, and consequently to organize itself as it sees fit, to legislate concerning its interests, to administer its services, and to determine the jurisdiction and competence of its courts. The exercise of these rights is

limited only by the exercise of the rights of other States in accordance with international law.

**Article 14**

Recognition implies that the State granting it accepts the personality of the new State, with all the rights and duties that international law prescribes for the two States.

**Article 15**

The right of each State to protect itself and to live its own life does not authorize it to commit unjust acts against another State.

**Article 16**

The jurisdiction of States within the limits of their national territory is exercised equally over all the inhabitants, whether nationals or aliens.

**Article 17**

Each State has the right to develop its cultural, political, and economic life freely and naturally. In this free development, the State shall respect the rights of the individual and the principles of universal morality.

**Article 18**

Respect for and the faithful observance of treaties constitute standards for the development of peaceful relations among States. International treaties and agreements should be public.

**Article 19**

No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic, and cultural elements.

**Article 20**

No State may use or encourage the use of coercive measures of an economic or political character in order to force the sovereign will of another State and obtain from it advantages of any kind.

**Article 21**

The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized.

**Article 22**

The American States bind themselves in their international relations not to have recourse to the use of force, except in the case of selfdefense in accordance with existing treaties or in fulfillment thereof.

**Article 23**

Measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in Articles 19 and 21.

## **Chapter V**

### **PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES**

#### **Article 24**

International disputes between Member States shall be submitted to the peaceful procedures set forth in this Charter.

This provision shall not be interpreted as an impairment of the rights and obligations of the Member States under Articles 34 and 35 of the Charter of the United Nations.

#### **Article 25**

The following are peaceful procedures: direct negotiation, good offices, mediation, investigation and conciliation, judicial settlement, arbitration, and those which the parties to the dispute may especially agree upon at any time.

#### **Article 26**

In the event that a dispute arises between two or more American States which, in the opinion of one of them, cannot be settled through the usual diplomatic channels, the parties shall agree on some other peaceful procedure that will enable them to reach a solution.

#### **Article 27**

A special treaty will establish adequate means for the settlement of disputes and will determine pertinent procedures for each peaceful means such that no dispute between American States may remain without definitive settlement within a reasonable period of time.

## **Chapter VI**

### **COLLECTIVE SECURITY**

#### **Article 28**

Every act of aggression by a State against the territorial integrity or the inviolability of the territory or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American State shall be considered an act of aggression against the other American States.

#### **Article 29**

If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an armed attack or by an act of aggression that is not an armed attack, or by an extracontinental conflict, or by a conflict between two or more American States, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the American States, in furtherance of the principles of continental solidarity or collective selfdefense, shall apply the measures and procedures established in the special treaties on the subject.

## **Chapter VII**

### **INTEGRAL DEVELOPMENT**

#### **Article 30**

The Member States, inspired by the principles of interAmerican solidarity and cooperation, pledge themselves to a united effort to ensure international social justice in their relations and integral development for their peoples, as conditions essential to peace and security. Integral development encompasses the economic, social, educational, cultural,

scientific, and technological fields through which the goals that each country sets for accomplishing it should be achieved.

(...)

## **Part Two**

### **Chapter VIII**

#### **THE ORGANS**

##### **Article 53**

The Organization of American States accomplishes its purposes by means of:

- a) The General Assembly;
- b) The Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs;
- c) The Councils;
- d) The Inter-American Juridical Committee;
- e) The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights;
- f) The General Secretariat;
- g) The Specialized Conferences; and
- h) The Specialized Organizations.

There may be established, in addition to those provided for in the Charter and in accordance with the provisions thereof, such subsidiary organs, agencies, and other entities as are considered necessary.

(...)

## **Part Three**

### **Chapter XIX**

#### **THE UNITED NATIONS**

##### **Article 131**

None of the provisions of this Charter shall be construed as impairing the rights and obligations of the Member States under the Charter of the United Nations.

## **American Treaty on Pacific Settlement (Pact of Bogota), April 30, 1948**

During the Bogota conference in 1948 leaders of the American States also adopted the third element of the contemporary inter-American system. It is the *American Treaty on Pacific Settlement*. This is confirmation of the basic rule of international relations



in the Western Hemisphere which is also a heritage of the Pan American movement, namely the peaceful settlement of conflicts between American States. The process of formulating this Treaty, which is called the Pact of Bogota, was quite difficult. This is because the Treaty very precisely regulates the procedures that have to be used in the event of conflict between States. The statement which talks about the unconditional acceptance of the judgments of International Court of Justice was very controversial, and for some countries difficult to accept. Also the Treaty says that “if the parties fail to agree as to whether the Court has jurisdiction over the controversy, the Court itself shall first decide that question”. The great achievement of the Treaty is a very precise catalogue of instruments that are at the disposal of the signatories. Diplomatic negotiations, good offices, conciliation or legal proceedings are worth mentioning. These kinds of statements raised some doubts among the American States. Some of them were not convinced that such a strong role of the international institutions is required, especially on the eve of the Cold War and after the formulation of the US doctrine of the containment of communism in the world. Those doubts and anxieties had their impact on the ratification process. Although, the Treaty was signed by the leaders of 21 countries, it was ratified only by 14 states, the United States, among others, expressed strong objections. In effect, the US did not ratify the Pact of Bogota. As a result, the *American Treaty on Pacific Settlement* has the weakest legitimacy from all the foundations of modern inter-American system.

### American Treaty on Pacific Settlement (Pact of Bogota), April 30, 1948

Source: <http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/treaties/a-42.html> (8.10.2013)

<http://www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/70580.htm> (08.10.2013)

In the name of their peoples, the Governments represented at the Ninth International Conference of American States have resolved, in fulfillment of Article XXIII of the Charter of the Organization of American States, to conclude the following Treaty:

#### **CHAPTER ONE**

##### **GENERAL OBLIGATION TO SETTLE DISPUTES BY PACIFIC MEANS**

ARTICLE I. The High Contracting Parties, solemnly reaffirming their commitments made in earlier international conventions and declarations, as well as in the Charter of the United Nations, agree to refrain from the threat or the use of force, or from any other means of coercion for the settlement of their controversies, and to have recourse at all times to pacific procedures.

ARTICLE II. The High Contracting Parties recognize the obligation to settle international controversies by regional procedures before referring them to the Security Council of the United Nations.

Consequently, in the event that a controversy arises between two or more signatory states which, in the opinion of the parties, cannot be settled by direct negotiations

through the usual diplomatic channels, the parties bind themselves to use the procedures established in the present Treaty, in the manner and under the conditions provided for in the following articles, or, alternatively, such special procedures as, in their opinion, will permit them to arrive at a solution.

ARTICLE III. The order of the pacific procedures established in the present Treaty does not signify that the parties may not have recourse to the procedure which they consider most appropriate in each case, or that they should use all these procedures, or that any of them have preference over others except as expressly provided.

ARTICLE IV. Once any pacific procedure has been initiated, whether by agreement between the parties or in fulfillment of the present Treaty or a previous pact, no other procedure may be commenced until that procedure is concluded.

ARTICLE V. The aforesaid procedures may not be applied to matters which, by their nature, are within the domestic jurisdiction of the state. If the parties are not in agreement as to whether the controversy concerns a matter of domestic jurisdiction, this preliminary question shall be submitted to decision by the International Court of Justice, at the request of any of the parties.

ARTICLE VI. The aforesaid procedures, furthermore, may not be applied to matters already settled by arrangement between the parties, or by arbitral award or by decision of an international court, or which are governed by agreements or treaties in force on the date of the conclusion of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE VII. The High Contracting Parties bind themselves not to make diplomatic representations in order to protect their nationals, or to refer a controversy to a court of international jurisdiction for that purpose, when the said nationals have had available the means to place their case before competent domestic courts of the respective state.

ARTICLE VIII. Neither recourse to pacific means for the solution of controversies, nor the recommendation of their use, shall, in the case of an armed attack, be ground for delaying the exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense, as provided for in the Charter of the United Nations.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **PROCEDURES OF GOOD OFFICES AND MEDIATION**

ARTICLE IX. The procedure of good offices consists in the attempt by one or more American Governments not parties to the controversy, or by one or more eminent citizens of any American State which is not a party to the controversy, to bring the parties together, so as to make it possible for them to reach an adequate solution between themselves.

ARTICLE X. Once the parties have been brought together and have resumed direct negotiations, no further action is to be taken by the states or citizens that have offered their good offices or have accepted an invitation to offer them; they may, however, by agreement between the parties, be present at the negotiations.

ARTICLE XI. The procedure of mediation consists in the submission of the controversy to one or more American Governments not parties to the controversy, or to one or more eminent citizens of any American State not a party to the controversy. In either case the mediator or mediators shall be chosen by mutual agreement between the parties.

ARTICLE XII. The functions of the mediator or mediators shall be to assist the parties in the settlement of controversies in the simplest and most direct manner, avoiding formalities and seeking an acceptable solution. No report shall be made by the mediator and, so far as he is concerned, the proceedings shall be wholly confidential.

(...)

## CHAPTER THREE

### PROCEDURE OF INVESTIGATION AND CONCILIATION

ARTICLE XV. The procedure of investigation and conciliation consists in the submission of the controversy to a Commission of Investigation and Conciliation, which shall be established in accordance with the provisions established in subsequent articles of the present Treaty, and which shall function within the limitations prescribed therein.

ARTICLE XVI. The party initiating the procedure of investigation and conciliation shall request the Council of the Organization of American States to convoke the Commission of Investigation and Conciliation. The Council for its part shall take immediate steps to convoke it.

Once the request to convoke the Commission has been received, the controversy between the parties shall immediately be suspended, and the parties shall refrain from any act that might make conciliation more difficult. To that end, at the request of one of the parties, the Council of the Organization of American States may, pending the convocation of the Commission, make appropriate recommendations to the parties.

ARTICLE XVII. Each of the High Contracting Parties may appoint, by means of a bilateral agreement consisting of a simple exchange of notes with each of the other signatories, two members of the Commission of Investigation and Conciliation, only one of whom may be of its own nationality. The fifth member, who shall perform the functions of chairman, shall be selected immediately by common agreement of the members thus appointed.

Any one of the contracting parties may remove members whom it has appointed, whether nationals or aliens; at the same time it shall appoint the successor. If this is not done, the removal shall be considered as not having been made. The appointments and substitutions shall be registered with the Pan American Union, which shall endeavor to ensure that the commissions maintain their full complement of five members.

ARTICLE XVIII. Without prejudice to the provisions of the foregoing article, the Pan American Union shall draw up a permanent panel of American conciliators, to be made up as follows: a) Each of the High Contracting Parties shall appoint, for three year periods, two of their nationals who enjoy the highest reputation for fairness, competence and integrity; b) The Pan American Union shall request of the candidates notice of their formal acceptance, and it shall place on the panel of conciliators the names of the persons who so notify it; c) The governments may, at any time, fill vacancies occurring among their appointees; and they may reappoint their members.

ARTICLE XIX. In the event that a controversy should arise between two or more American States that have not appointed the Commission referred to in Article XVII, the following procedure shall be observed:

- a) Each party shall designate two members from the permanent panel of American conciliators, who are not of the same nationality as the appointing party.
- b) These four members shall in turn choose a fifth member, from the permanent panel, not of the nationality of either party.
- c) If, within a period of thirty days following the notification of their selection, the four members are unable to agree upon a fifth member, they shall each separately list the conciliators composing the permanent panel, in order of their preference, and upon comparison of the lists so prepared, the one who first receives a majority of votes shall be declared elected. The person so elected shall perform the duties of chairman of the Commission.

ARTICLE XX. In convening the Commission of Investigation and Conciliation, the Council of the Organization of American States shall determine the place where the Commission

shall meet. Thereafter, the Commission may determine the place or places in which it is to function, taking into account the best facilities for the performance of its work.

ARTICLE XXI. When more than two states are involved in the same controversy, the states that hold similar points of view shall be considered as a single party. If they have different interests they shall be entitled to increase the number of conciliators in order that all parties may have equal representation. The chairman shall be elected in the manner set forth in Article XIX.

ARTICLE XXII. It shall be the duty of the Commission of Investigation and Conciliation to clarify the points in dispute between the parties and to endeavor to bring about an agreement between them upon mutually acceptable terms. The Commission shall institute such investigations of the facts involved in the controversy as it may deem necessary for the purpose of proposing acceptable bases of settlement.

ARTICLE XXII. It shall be the duty of the parties to facilitate the work of the Commission and to supply it, to the fullest extent possible, with all useful documents and information, and also to use the means at their disposal to enable the Commission to summon and hear witnesses or experts and perform other tasks in the territories of the parties, in conformity with their laws.

ARTICLE XXIV. During the proceedings before the Commission, the parties shall be represented by plenipotentiary delegates or by agents, who shall serve as intermediaries between them and the Commission. The parties and the Commission may use the services of technical advisers and experts.

ARTICLE XXV. The Commission shall conclude its work within a period of six months from the date of its installation; but the parties may, by mutual agreement, extend the period.

ARTICLE XXVI. If, in the opinion of the parties, the controversy relates exclusively to questions of fact, the Commission shall limit itself to investigating such questions, and shall conclude its activities with an appropriate report.

ARTICLE XXVII. If an agreement is reached by conciliation, the final report of the Commission shall be limited to the text of the agreement and shall be published after its transmittal to the parties, unless the parties decide otherwise. If no agreement is reached, the final report shall contain a summary of the work of the Commission; it shall be delivered to the parties, and shall be published after the expiration of six months unless the parties decide otherwise. In both cases, the final report shall be adopted by a majority vote.

ARTICLE XXVIII. The reports and conclusions of the Commission of Investigation and Conciliation shall not be binding upon the parties, either with respect to the statement of facts or in regard to questions of law, and they shall have no other character than that of recommendations submitted for the consideration of the parties in order to facilitate a friendly settlement of the controversy.

ARTICLE XXIX. The Commission of Investigation and Conciliation shall transmit to each of the parties, as well as to the Pan American Union, certified copies of the minutes of its proceedings. These minutes shall not be published unless the parties so decide.

ARTICLE XXX. Each member of the Commission shall receive financial remuneration, the amount of which shall be fixed by agreement between the parties. If the parties do not agree thereon, the Council of the Organization shall determine the remuneration. Each government shall pay its own expenses and an equal share of the common expenses of the Commission, including the aforementioned remunerations.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

ARTICLE XXXI. In conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the High Contracting Parties declare that they recognize, in relation to any other American State, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory *ipso facto*, without the necessity of any special agreement so long as the present Treaty is in force, in all disputes of a juridical nature that arise among them concerning:

- a) The interpretation of a treaty;
- b) Any question of international law;
- c) The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute the breach of an international obligation;
- d) The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

ARTICLE XXXII. When the conciliation procedure previously established in the present Treaty or by agreement of the parties does not lead to a solution, and the said parties have not agreed upon an arbitral procedure, either of them shall be entitled to have recourse to the International Court of Justice in the manner prescribed in Article 40 of the Statute thereof. The Court shall have compulsory jurisdiction in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 1, of the said Statute.

(...)

## CHAPTER FIVE

### PROCEDURE OF ARBITRATION

ARTICLE XXXVIII. Notwithstanding the provisions of Chapter Four of this Treaty, the High Contracting Parties may, if they so agree, submit to arbitration differences of any kind, whether juridical or not, that have arisen or may arise in the future between them.

(...)

ARTICLE XL. (1) Within a period of two months after notification of the decision of the Court in the case provided for in Article XXXV, each party shall name one arbiters of recognized competence in questions of international law and of the highest integrity, and shall transmit the designation to the Council of the Organization. At the same time, each party shall present to the Council a list of ten jurists chosen from among those on the general panel of members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration of The Hague who do not belong to its national group and who are willing to be members of the Arbitral Tribunal.

(2) The Council of the Organization shall, within the month following the presentation of the lists, proceed to establish the Arbitral Tribunal in the following manner:

- a) If the lists presented by the parties contain three names in common, such persons, together with the two directly named by the parties, shall constitute the Arbitral Tribunal;
- b) In case these lists contain more than three names in common, the three arbiters needed to complete the Tribunal shall be selected by lot;
- c) In the circumstances envisaged in the two preceding clauses, the five arbiters designated shall choose one of their number as presiding officer;
- d) If the lists contain only two names in common, such candidates and the two arbiters directly selected by the parties shall by common agreement choose the fifth arbiter, who shall preside over the Tribunal. The choice shall devolve upon a jurist on the aforesaid

general panel of the Permanent Court of Arbitration of The Hague who has not been included in the lists drawn up by the parties;

e) If the lists contain only one name in common, that person shall be a member of the Tribunal, and another name shall be chosen by lot from among the eighteen jurists remaining on the above-mentioned lists. The presiding officer shall be elected in accordance with the procedure established in the preceding clause;

f) If the lists contain no names in common, one arbiter shall be chosen by lot from each of the lists; and the fifth arbiter, who shall act as presiding officer, shall be chosen in the manner previously indicated;

g) If the four arbiters cannot agree upon a fifth arbiter within one month after the Council of the Organization has notified them of their appointment, each of them shall separately arrange the list of jurists in the order of their preference and, after comparison of the lists so formed, the person who first obtains a majority vote shall be declared elected.

(...)

## Resolutions Adopted at the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Punta del Este, Uruguay, January 22–31, 1962

When the Cold War fully erupted into the all-dimensional competition between the two superpowers, the United States used the Organization on American States as an instrument of American foreign policy. US diplomacy perceived the OAS as a good instrument to contain communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere. After the Cuban revolution and political changes introduced on the island by the revolutionary government of Fidel Castro, the OAS became a forum of several actions undertaken by US diplomacy to contain Cuban efforts to spread the revolution to other countries of Latin America and to put pressure upon the Cuban government. At the beginning of the 1960s, the Organization of American States became a forum of strong disputes between the United States and its allies in Latin American and the Cuban government. Finally, John F. Kennedy's administration decided to remove Cuba from the Organization. As the OAS Charter does not mention the procedure of exclusion a member state, US diplomacy had to look for other means to restrain the Cuban possibility of using the OAS to achieve its goals. The chosen solution was the exclusion of the Cuban communist government from the structures of the OAS. This was made during the Eighth Consultative Meeting of Foreign Ministers of the American States which took place at the beginning of 1962 in Punta del Este. The Kennedy administration wanted to pass a declaration that would condemn the communist government of Cuba as contradictory with the security system in the Western Hemisphere. In consequence, the US administration desired to pass both: sanctions against Cuba and the exclusion of the Cuban government from the OAS.

The effect of a fierce discussion during the Eighth Consultative Meeting was the adoption of the Final Act. However, the legitimacy of the resolutions that were included into the Final Act was weakened by the lack of unanimity. The Cuban delegation left the meeting. One of the strongest opponents of the US proposition presented by Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, was Mexico. Although, there was a consensus among the leaders that the Marxist-Leninist ideology is in contradiction with the basic rules of the inter-American system, there was no agreement on the proposition of the United States. The Final Act was adopted with a reservation of a number of Latin American states, principally Mexico. Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, Ecuador, Chile, among others voted against the exclusion of the Cuban government from the OAS. The decisive vote turned out to be that of Haiti. Later there were opinions that the Haitian government received significant economic aid in return for supporting the US initiative. The most important was Resolution VI that excluded the Cuban communist government from the OAS. However, there were also other resolutions, among others Resolution I *Communist Offensive in America*, and Resolution II *Special Consultative Committee on Security Against the Subversive Action of International Communism*.

#### Resolutions Adopted at the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Punta del Este, Uruguay, January 22–31, 1962

Source: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam17.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam17.asp) (9.10.2013)

##### **Resolution I. Communist Offensive in America**

1. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, convened in their Eighth Meeting of Consultation, declare that the continental unity and the democratic institutions of the hemisphere are now in danger.

The Ministers have been able to verify that the subversive offensive of communist governments, their agents, and the organizations which they control, has increased in intensity. The purpose of this offensive is the destruction of democratic institutions and the establishment of totalitarian dictatorships at the service of extra-continental powers.

The outstanding facts in this intensified offensive are the declarations set forth in official documents of the directing bodies of the international communist movement, that one of its principal objectives is the establishment of communist regimes in the underdeveloped countries and in Latin America; and the existence of a Marxist-Leninist government in Cuba which is publicly aligned with the doctrine and foreign policy of the communist powers.

2. In order to achieve their subversive purposes and hide their true intentions, the communist governments and their agents exploit the legitimate needs of the less-favored sectors of the population and the just national aspirations of the various peoples. With the pretext of defending popular interests' freedom is suppressed, democratic institutions are destroyed human rights are violated and the individual is subjected to materialistic ways of life imposed by the dictatorship of a single party. Under the slogan of "anti-imperialism" they try to establish an oppressive, aggressive imperialism which subordinates the subjugated nations to the militaristic and aggressive interests of extra-

continental powers. By maliciously utilizing the very principles of the inter-American system, they attempt to undermine democratic institutions and to strengthen and protect political penetration and aggression. The subversive methods of communist governments and their agents constitute one of the most subtle and dangerous forms of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries.

3. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs alert the Peoples of the hemisphere to the intensification of the subversive offensive of communist governments, their agents and the organizations that they control and to the tactics and methods that they employ and also warn them of the dangers this situation represents to representative democracy to respect for human rights, and to the self-determination of peoples.

The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system.

4. Convinced that the integrity of the democratic revolution of the American states can and must be preserved in the face of the subversive offensive of communism, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs proclaim the following basic political principles:

a. The faith of the American peoples in human rights, liberty, and national independence as a fundamental reason for their existence, as conceived by the founding fathers, who destroyed colonialism and brought the American republics into being;

b. The principle of nonintervention and the right of peoples to organize their way of life freely in the political, economic, and cultural spheres, expressing their wills through free elections, without foreign interference. The fallacies of communist propaganda cannot and should not obscure or hide the difference in philosophy which these principles represent when they are expressed by a democratic American country, and when communist governments and their agents attempt to utilize them for their own benefit;

c. The repudiation of repressive measures which, under the pretext of isolating or combating communism, may facilitate the appearance or strengthening of reactionary doctrines and methods which attempt to repress ideas of social progress and to confuse truly progressive and democratic labor organizations and cultural and political movements with communist subversion;

d. The affirmation that communism is not the way to achieve economic development and the elimination of social injustice in America. On the contrary, a democratic regime can encompass all the efforts for economic advancement and all of the measures for improvement and social progress without sacrificing the fundamental values of the human being. The mission of the peoples and governments of the hemisphere during the present generation is to achieve an accelerated development of their economies and to put an end to poverty, injustice, illness, and ignorance as was agreed in the Charter of Punta del Este; and

e. The most essential contribution of each American state in the collective effort to protect the inter-American system against communism is a steadily greater respect for human rights, improvement in democratic institutions and practices, and the adoption of measures that truly express the impulse for a revolutionary change in the economic and social structures of the American republics.

## **Resolution II. Special Consultative Committee on Security Against the Subversive Action of International Communism**

### **WHEREAS:**

International communism makes use of highly complex techniques of subversion, and in the task of counteracting such techniques certain states may benefit from mutual advice and support;



The, American states are firmly united for the common goal of fighting the subversive action of international communism and for the preservation of democracy in the Americas, as expressed in Resolution XXXII of the Ninth International Conference of American States. held in Bogota, in 1948, and that for such purpose they can and should assist each other, mainly through the use of the institutional resources of the Organization of American States; and

It is advisable, therefore, to make available to the Council of the Organization of American States a body of an advisory nature, made up of experts, the main purpose of which would be to advise the member governments which, as the case may be, require and request such assistance.

The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance,

#### **RESOLVES:**

1. To request the Council of the Organization of American States to maintain all necessary vigilance, for the purpose of warning against any acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security, or the preparation of such acts, resulting from the continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere, and to make recommendations to the governments of the member states with regard thereto.

2. To direct the Council of the Organization to establish a Special Consultative Committee on Security, composed of experts on security matters, for the purpose of advising the member states that may desire and request such assistance, the following procedures being observed:

a. The Council of the Organization shall select the membership of the Special Consultative Committee on Security from a list of candidates presented by the governments, and shall define immediately terms of reference for the Committee with a view to achieving the full purposes of this resolution.

b. The Committee shall submit reports to such member states as may request its assistance; however it shall not publish these reports without obtaining express authorization from the state dealt with in the report.

c. The Special Consultative Committee on Security shall submit to the Council of the Organization, no later than May 1, 1962, an initial general report, with pertinent recommendations regarding measures which should be taken.

d. The Committee shall function at the Pan American Union, which shall extend to it the technical, administrative, and financial facilities required for the work of the Committee.

e. The Committee shall function for the period deemed advisable by the Council of the Organization.

3. To urge the member states to take those steps that they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense, and to cooperate, as may be necessary or desirable, to strengthen their capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security resulting from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers, in accordance with the obligations established in treaties and agreements such as the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

#### **Resolution VI. Exclusion of the Present Government of Cuba from Participation in the Inter-American System**

##### **WHEREAS:**

The inter-American system is based on consistent adherence by its constituent states to certain objectives and principles of solidarity, set forth in the instruments that govern it:

Among these objectives and principles are those of respect for the freedom of man and preservation of his rights, the full exercise of representative democracy, nonintervention of one state in the internal or external affairs of another, and rejection of alliances and agreements that may lead to intervention in America by extra-continental powers;

The Seventh Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, held in San Jose, Costa Rica, condemned the intervention or the threat of intervention of extra-continental communist powers in the hemisphere and reiterated the obligation of the American states to observe faithfully the principles of the regional organization;

The present Government of Cuba has identified itself with the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has established a political, economic, and social system based on that doctrine, and accepts military assistance from extra-continental communist powers, including even the threat of military intervention in America on the part of the Soviet Union;

The Report of the Inter-American Peace Committee to the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs establishes that:

The present connections of the Government of Cuba with the Sino-Soviet bloc of countries are evidently incompatible with the principles and standards that govern the regional system, and particularly with the collective security established by the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance;

The above-mentioned Report of the Inter-American Peace Committee also states that:

It is evident that the ties of the Cuban Government with the Sino-Soviet bloc will prevent the said government from fulfilling the obligations stipulated in the Charter of the Organization and the Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance;

Such a situation in an American state violates the obligations inherent in membership in the regional system and is incompatible with that system;

The attitude adopted by the present Government of Cuba and its acceptance of military assistance offered by extra-continental communist powers breaks down the effective defense of the inter-American system; and

No member state of the inter-American system can claim the rights and privileges pertaining thereto if it denies or fails to recognize the corresponding obligations.

The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance

#### **DECLARES:**

1. That, as a consequence of repeated acts, the present Government of Cuba has voluntarily placed itself outside the inter-American system.
2. That this situation demands unceasing vigilance on the part of the member states of the Organization of American States, which shall report to the Council any fact or situation that could endanger the peace and security of the hemisphere.
3. That the American states have a collective interest in strengthening the inter-American system and reuniting it on the basis of respect for human rights and the principles and objectives relative to the exercise of democracy set forth in the Charter of the Organization; and, therefore

#### **RESOLVES:**

1. That adherence by any member of the Organization of American States to Marxism-Leninism is incompatible with the inter-American system and the alignment of such a government with the communist bloc breaks the unity and solidarity of the hemisphere.

2. That the present Government of Cuba, which has officially identified itself as a Marxist-Leninist government, is incompatible with the principles and objectives of the inter-American system.
3. That this incompatibility excludes the present Government of Cuba from participation in the inter-American system.
4. That the Council of the Organization of American States and the other organs and organizations the inter-American system adopt without delay the measures necessary to comply with this resolution.



## Chapter Seven

# The Cold War in the Western Hemisphere

During the Cold War period, relations between the United States and Latin American and Caribbean countries were very profound. As the absolute priority of US foreign policy became security, in the sense of communism containment, it was natural that the nearest neighborhood must be secure in a special way. The construction of the new inter-American system, based on the Rio Treaty, the OAS Charter and the Pact of Bogota was only the first step. US diplomacy understood very well, that in the case of communism containment in the Western Hemisphere, it must be ready to use all possible instruments of its foreign policy. It became clear for Latin American leaders that there will be no ideological freedom in those conditions. They were conscious that this came at a time of US domination in the region. A fear of the Latin Americans was growing with the passage of time. Already the first crisis in the region related to the ideological differences and the attempt to gain more independence from the United States was an excellent example of the US's later policy toward Latin American and Caribbean countries. Jacobo Arbenz attempted to carry out this policy in Guatemala. It ended with the deep interference of the United States in the internal affairs of this country and finally his overthrow, deeply inspired and supported by the United States. During the conflict with Arbenz administration, US diplomacy desired to use inter-American mechanisms to oust him from power but also to strengthen hemispheric cooperation against communism. Since that moment, every attempt at implementing an independent policy was perceived and presented by the United States as an ideological clash. Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, are the most obvious examples. With this situation it is not surprising that all those who perceived the United States as a superpower that wanted to dominate in the region, were its strong critics. After the success of the Cuban revolution, the most important critic of the US policy in the region became revolutionary Cuba and its leaders, Fidel Castro and Ernesto 'Che' Guevara. 'The loss of Cuba' intensified US efforts to change accents in its Latin American policy. The Alliance for Progress was an American attempt at achieving its objectives in the region by other instruments. However, it never resigned from the desire to dominate the region. Although John F. Kennedy and Jimmy Carter were aware of the disadvantages of that kind of policy, all American administrations during the Cold War period were firm in their faith in the containment doctrine. Some of them were more resolute in their decisions but all aimed to reach the same goal, first to contain

communism and after the Cuban revolution – not allowing another Cuba to appear. That is why the Reagan administration was so furious about the Sandinista government in Nicaragua and the guerilla movements in other Central American countries. For him, the success of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua and the subsequent success of the leftist guerillas in El Salvador or Guatemala posed a real danger for the national security of the United States. He was convinced that his duty is to defend the security of the United States using all possible instruments.

## Caracas Declaration of Solidarity, March 28, 1954

In the mid 1950s, the newly established inter-American system had its first important test. The internal changes in Guatemala and the reforms that were undertaken in this country by President Jacobo Arbenz created a very tense relations with the United States. Dwight Eisenhower's administration was afraid that President Arbenz was trying to introduce socialist reforms and accused him of being communist and importing Marxist-Leninist ideology to Guatemala and the Western Hemisphere. As the containment of international communism was the principle of US foreign policy, the Eisenhower administration decided to use a broad spectrum of instruments of its foreign policy. The main instrument used by the US in Guatemala was the inspiration of a military coup. However, the US administration decided to use others instruments too. One of them was the Organization of American States.

As the Rio Treaty permitted joint action in the event of foreign intervention that is not an armed attack, the US administration decided to use the newly established mechanisms of the inter-American system. In effect, the Tenth Inter-American Conference of the Organization of American States was held in Caracas, Venezuela in March 1954. The head of the US delegation was Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. He was strongly determined to pass a joint declaration that would condemn communist ideology and its expansion. However, this was not an easy task. Most of the Latin American leaders were afraid that the agreement on using the statements of the Rio Treaty would open the door to US interventions in the internal affairs of Latin American countries. Also, for Latin American leaders, a discussion about the possibilities of US economic aid for the region was more important than the condemnation of communism. Meanwhile, Secretary of State Dulles only wanted to discuss the draft of the declaration that would denounce communism. His proposition included a statement that would permit using the Rio Treaty and its provisions against foreign intervention in the American States in the event of establishing a communist system in any of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. This proposition was strongly opposed by the Latin American leaders. In effect of Secretary Dulles' huge determination, the conference concluded with the adoption of *Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of*

*the American States Against International Communist Intervention.* The US delegation achieved its objective. This was the first time that the United States used the OAS as an instrument of its Latin American policy in such an obvious way.

Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States Against International Communist Intervention (Caracas Declaration of Solidarity), March 28, 1954

Source: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam10.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam10.asp) (21.01.2014)

**WHEREAS:**

The American republics at the Ninth International Conference of American States declared that international communism, by its antidemocratic nature and its interventionist tendency, is incompatible with the concept of American freedom and resolved to adopt within their respective territories the measures necessary to eradicate and prevent subversive activities;

(...)

The Tenth Inter-American Conference

**CONDEMNS:**

The activities of the international communist movement as constituting intervention in American affairs;

**EXPRESSES:**

The determination of the American States to take the necessary measures to protect their political independence against the intervention of international communism, acting in the interests of an alien despotism;

**REITERATES:**

The faith of the peoples of America in the effective exercise of representative democracy as the best means to promote their social and political progress; and

**DECLARES:**

That the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international communist movement extending to this Hemisphere the political system of an extra continental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action In accordance with existing treaties.

**II**

**RECOMMENDS:**

That without prejudice to such other measures as they may consider desirable, special attention be given by each of the American governments to the following steps for the purpose of counteracting the subversive activities of the international communist movement within their respective jurisdictions:

1. Measures to require disclosure of the identity, activities, and sources of funds, of those who are spreading propaganda of the international communist movement or who travel in the interests of that movement, and of those who act as its agents or in its behalf; and
2. The exchange of information among governments to assist in fulfilling the purpose of the resolutions adopted by the Inter-American Conferences and Meetings of Ministers of Foreign Affairs regarding international communism.

### III

This declaration of foreign policy made by the American republics in relation to dangers originating outside this hemisphere is designed to protect and not to impair the inalienable right of each American State freely to choose its own form of government and economic system and to live its own social and cultural life.

## The Alliance for Progress

The geopolitical situation in the world changed dramatically after the end of World War II. The appearance of new superpowers and the new competition in international relations have changed the situation in the Western Hemisphere too. Both the United States and the Soviet Union perceived Latin America as an exclusive sphere of the former. This perception of Latin America by the superpowers contributed to the loss of interest in Latin American region. At the beginning of the Cold War, the United States perceived the region as secure meanwhile the Soviet Union was not ready to start competition with the United States in their backyard. The situation changed significantly after the successful revolution in Cuba. President John F. Kennedy was strongly preoccupied by the possibility of an expanding revolution from Cuba to the other Latin American countries. This was closely related to a significant increase of Soviet influence in the region and constituted a real danger for the United States. The American administration undertook different instruments of its foreign policy to pressure the new Cuban government and to stop the export of the revolution from Cuba. It used military intervention (the Bay of Pig Invasion), diplomacy (mainly at the OAS forum), and it also decided to use economic instruments. At the beginning of his administration, John F. Kennedy proposed the idea of a broad program of economic aid for Latin American countries. The idea referred to the Marshall Plan dedicated to European countries after the World War II. One of its principal objectives was containment of the expansion of Marxist-Leninist ideology in the European countries. The Alliance for Progress had the same goal. Economic aid to Latin America would help improve the social and economic conditions of the residents, which would, in turn, weaken radical and revolutionary attitudes. In the presidential campaign in 1960, John F. Kennedy already announced the necessity to implement a broad program of economic aid for Latin America referred to as the Alliance for Progress. He confirmed that idea in his inaugural address. He referred to the revolutionary tradition of the United States, the American mission of the promotion of democracy. This is why he



proposed a peaceful revolution instead of a violent one. The proposition of the Alliance for Progress had to be the first step of this kind of revolution.

On March 13, 1961 during his meeting with Latin American diplomats in Washington D.C., President Kennedy officially presented the Alliance for Progress. In his speech, he referred to the common heritage of the nations of the Western Hemisphere. It was a quite fresh vision of the US Latin American policy. Since then the containment of communism in Latin America had to be carried out through the promotion of democracy, economic development and improvement of living conditions in the countries of Latin America. The Alliance for Progress program had to serve those aims. In general, the proposition was well received by Latin American leaders. Although most of them perceived it as an instrument that strengthened US hegemony in the region, there was a broad will to participate in the US's proposal. As Kennedy's idea of the program was based on cooperation with Latin American countries, he asked to convoke the Inter-American Economic and Social Council that would specify the final version of the program. The meeting was held in Punta del Este, Uruguay, in August 1961. The effect of the meeting was the signing of two documents: *Declaration of the People of the America* and the *Charter of Punta del Este* that established the Alliance for Progress program.

#### Address by President Kennedy at a White House Reception for Latin American Diplomats and Members of Congress, March 13, 1961

Source: The Department of State Bulletin, vol. XLIV, no 1136, April 3, 1961, pp. 471-474

(...)

We meet together as firm and ancient friends, united by history and experience and by our determination to advance the values of American civilization. For this new world of ours is not merely an accident of geography. Our continents are bound together by a common history – the endless exploration of new frontiers. Our nations are the product of a common struggle – the revolt from colonial rule. And our people share a common heritage – the quest for the dignity and the freedom of man.

(...)

As a citizen of the United States let me be the first to admit that we North Americans have not always grasped the significance of this common mission, just as it is also true that many in your own countries have not fully understood the urgency of the need to lift people from poverty and ignorance and despair. But we must turn from these mistakes – from the failures and the misunderstandings of the past – to a future full of peril but bright with hope.

Throughout Latin America – a continent rich in resources and in the spiritual and cultural achievements of its people – millions of men and women suffer the daily degradations of hunger and poverty. They lack decent shelter or protection from disease. Their children are deprived of the education or the jobs which are the gateway to a better life.

If we are to meet a problem so staggering in its dimensions, our approach must itself be equally bold, an approach consistent with the majestic concept of Operation Pan America.

Therefore I have called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress – alianza para Progreso – a vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work and land, health and schools – techo, trabajo y tierra, salud y escuela.

*First*, I propose that the American Republics begin on a vast new 10-year plan for the Americas, a plan to transform the 1960's into an historic decade of democratic progress.

(...)

And if we are successful, if our effort is bold enough and determined enough, then the close of this decade will mark the beginning of a new era in the American experience. The living standards of every American family will be on the rise, basic education will be available to all, hunger will be a forgotten experience, the need for massive outside help will have passed, most nations will have entered a period of self-sustaining growth, and, although there will be still much to do, every American Republic will be the master of its own revolution and its own hope and progress.

Let me stress that only the most determined efforts of the American nations themselves can bring success to this effort. They, and they alone, can mobilize their resources, enlist the energies of their people, and modify their social patterns so that all, and not just a privileged few, share in the fruits of growth. If this effort is made, then outside assistance will give a vital impetus to progress; without it, no amount of help will advance the welfare of the people.

(...)

*Secondly*, I will shortly request a ministerial meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, a meeting at which we can begin the massive planning effort which will be at the heart of the Alliance for Progress.

For if our alliance is to succeed, each Latin nation must formulate long-range plans for its own development-plans which establish targets and priorities, insure monetary stability, establish the machinery for vital social change, stimulate private activity and initiative, and provide for a maximum national effort.

(...)

*Third*, I have this evening signed a request to the Congress for \$500 million as a first step in fulfilling the Act of Bogota. The money will be used to combat illiteracy, improve the productivity and use of their land, wipe out disease, attack archaic tax and land-tenure structures, provide educational opportunities, and offer a broad range of projects designed to make the benefits of increasing abundance available to all. We will begin to commit these funds as soon as they are appropriated.

*Fourth*, we must support all economic integration which is a genuine step toward larger markets and greater competitive opportunity. The fragmentation of Latin American economies is a serious barrier to industrial growth.

(...)

*Fifth*, the United States is ready to cooperate in serious, case-by-case examinations of commodity market problems. Frequent violent changes in commodity prices seriously injure the economies of many Latin American countries, draining their resources and stultifying their growth. Together we must find practical methods of bringing an end to this pattern.

*Sixth*, we will immediately step up our food – for-peace emergency program, help to establish food reserves in areas of recurrent drought, and help provide school lunches for children and offer feed grains for use in rural development. For hungry men and women cannot wait for economic discussions or diplomatic meetings; their need is urgent, and their hunger rests heavily on the conscience of their fellow men.

*Seventh*, all the people of the hemisphere must be allowed to share in the expanding wonders of science-wonders which have captured man's imagination, challenged the powers of his mind, and given him the tools for rapid progress. I invite Latin American scientists to work with us in new projects in fields such as medicine and agriculture, physics and astronomy and desalinization, and to help plan for regional research laboratories in these and other fields, and to strengthen cooperation between American universities and laboratories.

(...)

*Eighth*, we must rapidly expand the training of those needed to man the economies of rapidly developing countries. This means expanded technical training programs, for which the Peace Corps, for example, will be available where needed. It also means assistance to Latin American universities, graduate schools, and research institutes.

We welcome proposals in Central America for intimate cooperation in higher education, cooperation which can achieve a regional effort of increased effectiveness and excellence. We are ready to help fill the gap in trained manpower, realizing that our ultimate goal must be a basic education for all who wish to learn.

*Ninth*, we reaffirm our pledge to come to the defense of any American nation whose independence is endangered. As confidence in the collective security system of the OAS [Organization of American States] spreads, it will be possible to devote to constructive use a major share of those resources now spent on the instruments of war. Even now, as the Government of Chile has said, the time has come to take the first steps toward sensible limitations of arms. And the new generation of military leaders has shown an increasing awareness that armies can not only defend their countries – they can, as we have learned through our own Corps of Engineers, help to build them.

*Tenth*, we invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need teachers of your literature and history and tradition, opportunities for our young people to study in your universities, access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers. For we know we have much to learn.

In this way you can help bring a fuller spiritual and intellectual life to the people of the United States and contribute to understanding and mutual respect among the nations of the hemisphere.

With steps such as these we propose to complete the revolution of the Americas, to build a hemisphere where all men can hope for a suitable standard of living and all can live out their lives in dignity and in freedom.

To achieve this goal political freedom must accompany material progress. Our Alliance for Progress is an alliance of free governments – and it must work to eliminate tyranny from a hemisphere in which it has no rightful place. Therefore let us express our special friendship to the people of Cuba and the Dominican Republic – and the hope they will soon rejoin the society of free men, uniting with us in our common effort.

This political freedom must be accompanied by social change. For unless necessary social reforms, including land and tax reform, are freely made, unless we broaden the opportunity of all of our people, unless the great mass of Americans share in increasing prosperity, then our alliance, our revolution, our dream, and our freedom will fail. But we call for social change by free men – change in the spirit of Washington and Jefferson, of Bolivar and San Martin and Marti – not change which seeks to impose on men tyrannies which we cast out a century and a half ago. Our motto is what it has always been – progress yes, tyranny no – *Progreso si, tirania no!*

But our greatest challenge comes from within the task of creating an American civilization where spiritual and cultural values are strengthened by an ever-broadening base of

material advance, where, within the rich diversity of its own traditions, each nation is free to follow its own path toward progress.

The completion of our task will, of course, require the efforts of all the governments of our hemisphere. But the efforts of governments alone will never be enough. In the end the people must choose and the people must help themselves.

And so I say to the men and women of the Americas – to the peasant in the fields, to the *obrero* [worker] in the cities, to the *estudiante* in the schools – prepare your mind and heart for the task ahead, call forth your strength, and let each devote his energies to the betterment of all so that your children and our children in this hemisphere can find an ever richer and a freer life.

Let us once again transform the American Continent into a vast crucible of revolutionary ideas and efforts, a tribute to the power of the creative energies of free men and women, an example to all the world that liberty and progress walk hand in hand. Let us once again awaken our American revolution until it guides the struggles of people everywhere – not with an imperialism of force or fear but the rule of courage and freedom and hope for the future of man.

## The Charter of Punta del Este, Establishing an Alliance for Progress Within the Framework of Operation Pan America, August 17, 1961

The special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council which took place at Punta del Este Uruguay between August 5 and August 17, 1961

Source: *The Charter of Punta del Este*, August 17, 1961, in: Documents on American Foreign Relations – 1961, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, 1962

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam16.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam16.asp) (9.10.2013)

### Preamble

We, the American Republics, hereby proclaim our decision to unite in a common effort to bring our people accelerated economic progress and broader social justice within the framework of personal dignity and political liberty.

Almost two hundred years ago we began in this Hemisphere the long struggle for freedom which now inspires people in all parts of the world. Today, in ancient lands, men moved to hope by the revolutions of your young nations search for liberty. Now we must give a new meaning to that revolutionary heritage. For America stands at a turning point in history. The men and women of our Hemisphere are reaching for the better life which today's skills have placed within their grasp. They are determined for themselves and their children to have decent and ever more abundant lives, to gain access to knowledge and equal opportunity for all, to end those conditions which benefit the few at the expense of the needs and dignity of the many. It is our inescapable task to fulfill these just desires-to demonstrate to the poor and forsaken of our countries, and of all lands, that the creative powers of free men hold the key to their progress and to the progress of future generations. And our certainty of ultimate success rests not alone on our faith in ourselves and in our nations but on the indomitable spirit of free man which has been the heritage of American civilization.

Inspired by these principles, and by the principles of Operation Pan America and the Act of Bogota, the American Republics hereby resolve to adopt the following program of action to establish and carry forward an Alliance for Progress.

### **Title I. Objective of the Alliance for Progress**

It is the purpose of the Alliance for Progress to enlist the full energies of the people and governments of the American republics in a great cooperative effort to accelerate the economic and social development of the participating countries of Latin America, so that they may achieve maximum levels of well-being, with equal opportunities for all, in democratic societies adapted to their own needs and desires.

The American Republics agree to work toward the achievement of the following fundamental goals in the present decade:

1. To achieve in the participating Latin American countries a substantial and sustained growth of per capita income at a rate designed to attain, at the earliest possible date, levels of income capable of assuring self-sustaining development, and sufficient to make Latin American income levels constantly larger in relation to the levels of the more industrialized nations. In this way the gap between the living standards of Latin America and those of the more developed countries can be narrowed. Similarly, presently existing differences in income levels among the Latin American countries will be reduced by accelerating the development of the relatively less developed countries and granting them maximum priority in the distribution of resources and in international cooperation in General In evaluating the degree of relative development, account will be taken not only of average levels of real income and gross product per capita, but also of indices of infant mortality, illiteracy, and per capita daily caloric intake.

It is recognized that, in order to reach these objectives within a reasonable time, the rate of economic growth in any country of Latin America should be not less than 2.5 percent per capita per year, and that each participating country should determine its own growth target in the light of its stage of social and economic evolution, resource endowment, and ability to mobilize national efforts for development.

2. To make the benefits of economic progress available to all citizens of all economic and social groups through a more equitable distribution of national income, raising more rapidly the income and standard of living of the needier sectors of the population, at the same time that a higher proportion of the national product is devoted to investment.

3. To achieve balanced diversification in national economic structures, both regional and functional, making them increasingly free from dependence on the export of a limited number of primary products and the importation of capital goods awhile attaining stability in the prices of exports or in income derived from exports.

4. To accelerate the process of rational industrialization so as to increase the productivity of the economy as a whole, taking full advantage of the talents and energies of both the private and public sectors, utilizing the natural resources of the country and providing productive and remunerative employment for unemployed or part-time workers. Within this process of industrialization, special attention should be given to the establishment and development of capital-goods industries.

5. To raise greatly the level of agricultural productivity and output and to improve related storage transportation, and marketing services.

6. To encourage, in accordance with the characteristics of each country, programs of comprehensive agrarian reform leading to the effective transformation, where required, of unjust structures and systems of land tenure and use, with a view to replacing latifundia and dwarf holdings by an equitable system of land tenure so that, with the help of timely and adequate credit, technical assistance and facilities for the marketing and distribution of products, the land will become for the man who works it the basis of his

economic stability, the foundation of his increasing welfare, and the guarantee of his freedom and dignity.

7. To eliminate adult illiteracy and by 1970 to assure, as a minimum, access to 6 years of primary education for each school-age child in Latin America; to modernize and expand vocational, secondary and higher educational and training facilities, to strengthen the capacity for basic and applied research; and to provide the competent personnel required in rapidly-growing societies.

8. To increase life expectancy at birth by a minimum of 5 years, and to increase the ability to learn and produce, by improving individual and public health. To attain this goal it will be necessary, among other measures, to provide adequate potable water supply and sewage disposal to not less than 70 percent of the urban and 50 percent of the rural population; to reduce the mortality rate of children less than 5 years of age by at least one-half; to control the more serious communicable diseases, according to their importance as a cause of sickness, disability, and death; to eradicate those illnesses, especially malaria, for which effective techniques are known; to improve nutrition; to train medical and health personnel to meet at least minimum requirements; to improve basic health services at national and local levels; and to intensify scientific research and apply its results more fully and effectively to the prevention and cure of illness.

9. To increase the construction of low-cost houses for low-income families in order to replace inadequate and deficient housing and to reduce housing shortages; and to provide necessary public services to both urban and rural centers of population.

10. To maintain stable price levels, avoiding inflation or deflation and the consequent social hardships and maldistribution of resources, always bearing in mind the necessity of maintaining an adequate rate of economic growth.

11. To strengthen existing agreements on economic integration, with a view to the ultimate fulfillment of aspirations for a Latin American common market that will expand and diversify trade among the Latin American countries and thus contribute to the economic growth of the region.

12. To develop cooperative programs designed to prevent the harmful effects of excessive fluctuations in the foreign exchange earnings derived from exports of primary products, which are of vital importance to economic and social development; and to adopt the measures necessary to facilitate the access of Latin American exports to goals it will be necessary.

## **Title II. Economic and Social Development**

### **Chapter I. Basic Requirements for Economic and Social Development**

The American Republics recognize that to achieve the foregoing goals it will be necessary:

1. That comprehensive and well-conceived national programs of economic and social development, aimed at the achievement of self-sustaining growth, be carried out in accordance with democratic principles.

2. That national programs of economic and social development be based on the principle of self-help-as established in the Act of Bogota-and on the maximum use of domestic resources, taking into account the special conditions of each country.

3. That in the preparation and execution of plans for economic and social development, women should be placed on an equal footing with men.

4. That the Latin American countries obtain sufficient external financial assistance, a substantial portion of which should be extended on flexible conditions with respect to periods and terms of repayment and forms of utilization, in order to supplement domestic capital formation and reinforce their import capacity; and that, in support of well-conceived programs, which include the necessary structural reforms and measures for

the mobilization of internal resources, a supply of capital from all external sources during the coming 10 years of at least 20 billion dollars be made available to the Latin American countries, with priority to the relatively less developed countries. The greater part of this sum should be in public funds.

5. That institutions in both the public and private sectors, including labor organizations, cooperatives, and commercial, industrial, and financial institutions, be strengthened and improved for the increasing and effective use of domestic resources, and that the social reforms necessary to permit a fair distribution of the fruits of economic and social progress be carried out.

## **Chapter II. National Development Programs**

1. Participating Latin American countries agree to introduce or strengthen systems for the preparation, execution, and periodic revision of national programs for economic and social development consistent with the principles, objectives, and requirements contained in this document. Participating Latin American countries should formulate, if possible within the next eighteen months, long-term development programs. Such programs should embrace, according to the characteristics of each country, the elements outlined in the Appendix.

2. National development programs should incorporate self-help efforts directed to:

a. Improvement of human resources and widening of opportunities by raising general standards of education and health; improving and extending technical education and professional training with emphasis on science and technology; providing adequate remuneration for work performed, encouraging the talents of managers, entrepreneurs, and wage earners; providing more productive employment for underemployed manpower; establishing effective systems of labor relations, and procedures for consultation and collaboration among public authorities, employer associations, and labor organizations; promoting the establishment and expansion of local institutions for basic and applied research; and improving the standards of public administration.

b. Wider development and more efficient use of natural resources, especially those which are now idle or under-utilized, including measures for the processing of raw materials.

c. The strengthening of the agricultural base, progressively, extending the benefits of the land to those who work it, and ensuring in countries with Indian populations the integration of these populations into the economic, social, and cultural processes of modern life. To carry out these aims, measures should be adopted, among others, to establish or improve, as the case may be, the following services: extension, credit, technical assistance, agricultural research and mechanization; health and education; storage and distribution; cooperatives and farmers' associations; and community development.

d. More effective, rational and equitable mobilization and use of financial resources through the reform of tax structures, including fair and adequate taxation of large incomes and real estate, and the strict application of measures to improve fiscal administration. Development programs should include the adaptation of budget expenditures to development needs, measures for the maintenance of price stability, the creation of essential credit facilities at reasonable rates of interest, and the encouragement of private savings.

e. Promotion through appropriate measures, including the signing of agreements for the purpose of reducing or eliminating double taxation, of conditions that will encourage the flow of foreign investments and help to increase the capital resources of participating countries in need of capital.

f. Improvement of systems distribution and sales in order to make markets more competitive and prevent monopolistic practices.

(...)

## The Second Declaration of Havana, February 4, 1962

On February 4<sup>th</sup>, 1962 the Second General National Assembly of the People of Cuba adopted the Second Declaration of Havana (the first one was adopted in 1960). This was Cuba's reaction to the Kennedy's the Alliance for Progress initiative and the exclusion of the Cuban government from the structures of the Organization of American States. The document is a harsh attack on imperialism per se and the United States. In the Declaration, the authors accused imperialists of the hundreds years of exploitation and injustice. This refers not only to Cuba but to the entire Latin American region which was the subject of imperialist policy of, first, European powers, and then, the United States of America. The Declaration emphasized the example of the Cuban revolution as a model to follow by other nations of Latin America as a revolution could be the only measure to break with imperialist dependency. Also, the Declaration firmly criticized the Alliance for Progress and described it as an instrument of US imperialism that, in fact, wanted to strengthen Latin American dependency on the colossus from the North.

### The Second Declaration of Havana, February 4, 1962

Source: [http://artsci.wustl.edu/~ymiki/322c/course-readings/castro\\_second\\_declaration\\_o.pdf](http://artsci.wustl.edu/~ymiki/322c/course-readings/castro_second_declaration_o.pdf) (12.10.2013)

In 1895, Marti already pointed out the danger hovering over America and called imperialism by its name: imperialism. He pointed out to the people of Latin America that more than anyone, they had a stake in seeing that Cuba did not succumb to the greed of the Yankee, scornful of the peoples of Latin America. And with his own blood, shed for Cuba and America, he wrote the words which posthumously, in homage to his memory, the people of Cuba place at the head of this declaration.

#### **Humiliation**

Sixty seven years have passed. Puerto Rico was converted into a colony and is still a colony saturated with military bases. Cuba also fell into the Clutches of imperialism. Their troops occupied our territory. The Platt Amendment was imposed on our first constitution, as a humiliating clause which sanctioned the odious right of foreign intervention. Our riches passed into their hands, our history was falsified, our government and our politics were entirely molded in the interests of the overseers; the nation was subjected to sixty years of political, economic, and cultural suffocation.

But Cuba rose, Cuba was able to redeem itself from the bastard guardianship. Cuba broke the chains which tied its fortunes to those of the imperialist oppressor, redeemed its riches, reclaimed its culture, and unfurled its banner as the Free Territory of America.

Now the United States will never again be able to use Cuba's strength against America, but conversely, dominating the majority of the other Latin American states, the United States is attempting to use the strength of America against Cuba.



## Imperialist Powers

World War II, unleashed by the imperialist powers and into which were dragged the Soviet Union and other criminally invaded peoples of Asia and Europe who were invaded in a criminal manner and engaged in a bloody struggle of liberation culminated in the defeat of fascism, formation of the worldwide socialist camp and the struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for their sovereignty. Between 1945 and 1957, more than 1.2 billion human beings gained their independence in Asia and Africa. The blood shed by the people was not in vain.

The movement of the dependent and colonial peoples is a phenomenon of universal character which agitates the world and marks the final crisis of imperialism.

Cuba and Latin America are part of the world. Our problems form part of the problems engendered by the general crisis of imperialism and the struggle of the subjugated peoples the clash between the world that is being born and the world that is dying. The odious and brutal campaign unleashed against our nation expresses the desperate, as well as futile, effort which the imperialists are making to prevent the liberation of the people. Cuba hurts the imperialists in a special way.

What is it that is hidden behind the Yankee's hatred of the Cuban Revolution? What is it that rationally explains the conspiracy which unites, for the same aggressive purpose, the most powerful and richest imperialist power in the modern world and the oligarchies of an entire continent, which together are supposed to represent a population of 350 million human beings, against a small country of only seven million inhabitants, economically underdeveloped, without financial or military means to threaten the security or economy of any other country? What unites them and stirs them up in fear? What explains it is fear. Not fear of the Cuban Revolution but fear of the Latin American revolution. Not fear of the workers, peasants, intellectuals, students, and progressive sectors of the middle strata which, by revolutionary means, have taken power in Cuba; but fear that the workers, peasants, students, intellectuals, and progressive sectors of the middle strata will, by revolutionary means, take power in the oppressed and hungry countries exploited by the Yankee monopolies and reactionary oligarchies of America; fear that the plundered people of the continent will seize the arms from the oppressors and, like Cuba, declare themselves free people of America.

By crushing the Cuban Revolution, they hope to dispel the fear that torments them, the specter of the revolution that threatens them. By liquidating the Cuban Revolution, they hope to liquidate the revolutionary spirit of the people. They imagine in their delirium that Cuba is an exporter of revolutions. In their sleepless merchants' and usurers' minds there is the idea that revolutions can be bought, sold, rented, loaned, exported, and imported like some piece of merchandise. Ignorant of the objective laws that govern the development of human societies, they believe that their monopolistic, capitalistic, and semifeudal regimes are eternal. Educated in their own reactionary ideology, a mixture of superstition, ignorance, subjectivism, pragmatism, and other mental aberrations, they have an image of the world and of the march of history conforming to their interests as exploiting classes.

They imagine that revolutions are born or die in the brains of individuals or are caused by divine laws, and, moreover, that the gods are on their side. They have always thought that way from the devout patrician pagans of Roman slave society who hurled the early Christians to the lions at the circus, and the inquisitors of the Middle Ages who, as guardians of feudalism and absolute monarchy, burned at the stake the first representatives of the liberal thought of the nascent bourgeoisie, up to today's bishops who anathematize proletarian revolutions in defense of the bourgeois and monopolist regime.

All reactionary classes in all historical epochs, when the antagonism between exploiters and exploited reaches its highest peak, presaging the arrival of a new social regime, have turned to the worst weapons of repression and calumny against their adversaries. The primitive Christians were taken to their martyrdom accused of burning Rome and of sac-

rificing children on their altars. Philosophers like Giordano Bruno, reformers like Hus, and thousands of others who did not conform with the feudal order, were accused of heresy and taken by the inquisitors to be burned at the stake.

(...)

### **U.S. Policy**

North American imperialism's declared policy of sending soldiers to fight against the revolutionary movement of any country in Latin America, that is, to kill workers, students, peasants, Latin American men and women, has no other objective than the continued maintenance of its monopolistic interests and the privileges of the traitorous oligarchies which support it.

It can now be clearly seen that the military pacts signed by the government of the United States with Latin American governments often secret pacts and always behind the backs of the people invoking hypothetical foreign dangers which did not exist, had the sole and exclusive object of preventing the struggle of the people; they were pacts against the people, against the only danger the internal danger of the liberation movements that would imperil Yankee interests. It was not without reason that the people asked themselves: Why so many military agreements? Why the shipments of arms which, even though technically outmoded for modern war, are nevertheless efficient for smashing strikes, repressing popular demonstrations, staining the land with blood? Why the military missions, the pact of Rio de Janeiro and the thousand and one international conferences?

Since the end of World War II, the nations of Latin America have been impoverished more and more, their exports have less and less value, their imports cost more, the per capita income falls, the awful rate of infant mortality does not decrease, the number of illiterates is higher, the people lack jobs, land, adequate housing, schools, hospitals, means of communication, and means of life. On the other hand, North American investments exceed ten billion dollars. Latin America, moreover, provides cheap raw materials, and is the buyer of expensive finished articles. The United States trades with Latin America like the first Spanish conquerors, who bartered mirrors and trinkets for gold and silver. To guard that torrent of riches, to gain over more control of Latin America's resources and to exploit its suffering peoples that is what is hidden behind the military pacts, the military missions, and Washington's diplomatic lobbying.

(...)

This policy of gradual strangulation of the sovereignty of the Latin American nations, and of a free hand to intervene in their internal affairs, culminated in the recent meeting of foreign ministers at Punta del Este. Yankee imperialism gathered the ministers together to wrest from them through political pressure and unprecedented economic blackmail in collusion with a group of the most discredited rulers of this continent the renunciation of the national sovereignty of our peoples and the consecration of the odious Yankee right to intervention in the internal affairs of Latin America; the submission of the peoples completely to the will of the United States of North America, against which all our great men, from Bolivar to Sandino, fought. Neither the government of the United States, nor the representatives of the exploiting oligarchies, nor the big reactionary press, in the pay of the monopolies and feudal lords, concealed this, but openly demanded agreements which constituted formal suppression of the right of self determination of our peoples; abolishing it with a stroke of the pen at the most infamous conspiracy in the memory of this continent.

Behind closed doors, in repugnant and unlawful meetings, the Yankee minister of colonies dedicated entire days to beating down the resistance and scruples of some ministers, bringing into play the millions of the Yankee treasury in an undisguised buying and selling of votes. A handful of representatives of the oligarchies (of countries which together barely add up to a third of the continent's population) imposed agreements that

served up to the Yankee master on a silver platter, the had of a principle which cost the blood of all our countries since the wars of independence. The Pyrrhic character of such sad and fraudulent deeds of imperialism, their moral failure, the broken unanimity, and the universal scandal do not diminish the grave danger which agreements imposed at such a price have brought so close to the peoples of Latin America. At that evil conclave Cuba's thundering voice was raised without weakness or fear, to indict, before all the peoples of America and the world, the monstrous attempt, and to defend with a virility and dignity which will be clear in the annals of history, not only Cuba's rights but the deserted rights of all our sister nations of the American Continent. The word of Cuba would find no echo in that housebroken majority, but neither could it find a refutation; only impotent silence greeted its demolishing arguments and the clearness and courage of its words. But Cuba did not speak for the ministers, Cuba spoke for the people and for history, where its words will be echoed and answered.

At Punta del Este a great ideological battle unfolded between the Cuban Revolution and Yankee imperialism. Who did they represent there, for whom did each speak? Cuba represented the people; the United States represented the monopolies. Cuba spoke for America's exploited masses; the United States for the exploiting, oligarchical, and imperialist interests; Cuba for sovereignty; the United States for intervention; Cuba for the nationalization of foreign enterprises; the United States for new investments of foreign capital. Cuba for culture; the United States for ignorance. Cuba for agrarian reform; the United States for great landed estates. Cuba for the industrialization of America; the United States for underdevelopment. Cuba for creative work; the United States for sabotage and counterrevolutionary terror practiced by its agents the destruction of sugar-cane fields and factories, the bombing by their pirate planes of the labor of a peaceful people. Cuba for the murdered teachers; the United States for the assassins. Cuba for bread; the United States for hunger. Cuba for equality; the United States for privilege and discrimination. Cuba for the truth; the United States for lies. Cuba for liberation; the United States for oppression. Cuba for the bright future of humanity; the United States for the past without hope. Cuba for the heroes who fell at Giron to save the country from foreign domination; the United States for mercenaries and traitors who serve the foreigner against their country. Cuba for peace among peoples; the United States for aggression and war. Cuba for socialism; the United States for capitalism.

The agreements obtained by the United States through methods so shameful that the entire world criticizes them, do not diminish but increase the morality and justice of Cuba's stand, which exposes the sellout and treason of the oligarchies to the national interests and shows the people the road to liberation. It reveals the corruption of the exploiting classes for whom their representatives spoke at Punta del Este. The OAS has revealed for what it really is Yankee Ministry of Colonies, a military alliance, an apparatus of repression against the liberation movements of the Latin American peoples. Cuba has lived three years of the Revolution under the incessant harassment of Yankee intervention in our internal affairs. Pirate airplanes coming from the United States, dropping incendiaries, have burned millions of *arrobas* of sugar cane; acts of international sabotage perpetrated by Yankee agents, like the explosion of the ship *La Coubre*, have cost dozens of Cuban lives; thousands of North American weapons have been dropped by parachute by the U.S. military services onto our territory to promote subversion; hundreds of tons of explosive materials and bombs have been secretly landed on our coast from North American launches to promote sabotage and terrorism; a Cuban worker was tortured on the naval base of Guantanamo and deprived of his life with no due process before or any explanation later; our sugar quota was abruptly cut and an embargo proclaimed on parts and raw materials for factories and North American construction machinery in order to ruin our economy. Cuban ports and installations have been surprise attacked by armed ships and bombers from bases prepared by the United States. Mercenary troops, organized and trained in countries of Central America by the same government, have in a war-like manner invaded our territories, escorted by ships of the Yankee fleet and with aerial support from foreign bases, causing much loss of life as well as material wealth; counter-

revolutionary Cubans are being trained in the U.S. army and new plans of aggression against Cuba are being made. All this has been going on incessantly for three years, before the eyes of the whole continent and the OAS was not aware of it.

The ministers meet in Punta del Este and do not even admonish the U.S. government nor the governments who are material accomplices to these aggressions. They expel Cuba, the Latin American victim, the aggrieved nation. The United States has military pacts with nations of all the continents; military blocs with whatever fascist, militarist, and reactionary government there is in the world: NATO, SEATO and CENTO, to which we now have to add the OAS; it intervenes in Laos, in Viet Nam, in Korea, in Formosa, in Berlin. It openly sends ships to Santo Domingo in order to impose its law, its will, and announces its proposal to use its NATO allies to block commerce with Cuba. And the OAS is not aware! The ministers meet and expel Cuba, which has no military pacts with any country. Thus the government that organizes subversion throughout the world and forges military alliances on four continents, forces the expulsion of Cuba, accusing her of no less than subversion and having ties beyond the continent.

(...)

### **Punta del Este**

But why did they meet at Punta del Este despite this American reality? Perhaps to bring a single drop of hope? No! The people know that at Punta del Este the ministers, who expelled Cuba, met to renounce national sovereignty; that the government of the United States went there not only to establish the basis for aggression against Cuba, but the basis for intervention against the people's liberation movements in any American nation; that the United States is preparing a bloody drama for Latin America; that just as the exploiting oligarchies now renounce the principle of sovereignty, they will not hesitate to solicit intervention of Yankee troops against their own people, and that for this end the North American delegation proposed a watchdog committee against subversion in the Inter-American Defense Council, with executive powers, and the adoption of collective measures. Subversion for the Yankee imperialists is the struggle of hungry people for bread, the struggle of peasants for land, the struggle of the peoples against imperialist exploitation.

A "watchdog committee" with executive powers in the Inter-American Defense Council means a continental repressive force against the peoples under the command of the Pentagon. "Collective measures" means the landing of Yankee Marines in any country of America.

To the accusation that Cuba wants to export its revolution, we reply: Revolutions are not exported, they are made by the people.

(...)

What Cuba can give to the people, and has already given, is its example.

And what does the Cuban Revolution teach? That revolution is possible, that the people can make it, that in the contemporary world there are no forces capable of halting the liberation movement of the peoples.

Our triumph would never have been feasible if the Revolution itself had not been inexorably destined to arise out of existing conditions in our socioeconomic reality, a reality which exists to an even greater degree in a good number of Latin American countries.

It inevitably occurs that in the nations where the control of the Yankee monopolies is strongest, the exploitation of the oligarchy cruelest, and the situation of the laboring and peasant masses most unbearable, the political power appears most solid. The state of siege becomes habitual. Every manifestation of discontent by the masses is repressed by force. The democratic path is closed completely. The brutal character of dictatorship, the

form of rule adopted by the ruling classes, reveals itself more clearly than ever. It is then that the revolutionary explosion of the peoples becomes inevitable.

Although it is true that in those underdeveloped countries of America the working class is generally relatively small, there is a social class which, because of the subhuman conditions in which it lives, constitutes a potential force that, led by the workers and the revolutionary intellectuals, has a decisive importance in the struggle for national liberation the peasants.

In our countries are two conditions: an underdeveloped industry and an agrarian regime of feudal character. That is why, with all the hardships of the conditions of life of the urban workers, the rural population lives in even more horrible conditions of oppression and exploitation; but it is also, with exceptions, the absolute majority sector, at times exceeding seventy percent of the Latin American population.

Discounting the landlords, who often reside in the cities, the rest of that great mass gains its livelihood working as peons on the haciendas for the most miserable wages, or work the land under conditions of exploitation which in no manner puts the Middle Ages to shame. These circumstances determine that in Latin America the poor rural population constitutes a tremendous potential revolutionary force.

The armies, built and equipped for conventional war, which are the force on which the power of the exploiting classes rests, become absolutely impotent when they have to confront the irregular struggle of the peasants on their own terrain. They lose ten men for each revolutionary fighter who falls. Demoralization spreads rapidly among them from having to face an invisible and invincible enemy who does not offer them the opportunity of showing off their academy tactics and their braggadocio which they use so much in military displays to curb the city workers and the students.

The initial struggle by small combat units is incessantly fed by new forces, the mass movement begins to loosen its bonds, the old order little by little begins to break into a thousand pieces, and that is the moment when the working class and the urban masses decide the battle.

What is it that from the beginning of the struggle of those first nuclei makes them invincible, regardless of the numbers, power, the resources of their enemies? It is the aid of the people, and they will be able to count on that help of the people on an ever growing scale.

(...)

### **Unity**

No nation in Latin America is weak because each forms part of a family of 200 million brothers, who suffer the same miseries, who harbor the same sentiments, who have the same enemy, who dream about the same better future and who count upon the solidarity of all honest men and women throughout the world.

Great as was the epic of Latin American Independence, heroic as was that struggle, today's generation of Latin Americans is called upon to engage in an epic which is even greater and more decisive for humanity. For that struggle was for liberation from Spanish colonial power, from a decadent Spain invaded by the armies of Napoleon. Today the call for struggle is for liberation from the most powerful world imperialist center, from the strongest force of world imperialism and to render humanity a greater service than that rendered by our predecessors.

But this struggle, to a greater extent than the earlier one, will be waged by the masses, will be carried out by the people; the people are going to play a much more important role now than then, the leaders are less important and will be less important in this struggle than in the one before.

This epic before us is going to be written by the hungry Indian masses, the peasants without land, the exploited workers. It is going to be written by the progressive masses, the honest and brilliant intellectuals, who so greatly abound in our suffering Latin American countries. Struggles of masses and ideas. An epic which will be carried forward by our people, despised and maltreated by imperialism, our people, unreckoned with till today, who are now beginning to shake off their slumber. Imperialism considered us a weak and submissive flock; and now it begins to be terrified of that flock; a gigantic flock of 200 million Latin Americans in whom Yankee monopoly capitalism now sees its gravediggers.

This toiling humanity, inhumanly exploited, these paupers, controlled by the whip and overseer, have not been reckoned with or have been little reckoned with. From the dawn of independence their fate has been the same: Indians, gauchos, mestizos, zambos, quadroons, whites without property or income, all this human mass which formed the ranks of the "nation," which never reaped any benefits, which fell by the millions, which was cut into bits, which won independence from the mother country for the bourgeoisie, which was shut out from its share of the rewards, which continued to occupy the lowest step on the ladder of social benefits, which continued to die of hunger, curable diseases and neglect, because for them there were never enough essentials of life ordinary bread, a hospital bed, the medicine which cures, the hand which aids their fate has been all the same.

But now from one end of the continent to the other they are signaling with clarity that the hour has come the hour of their redemption. Now this anonymous mass, this America of color, somber, taciturn America, which all over the continent sings with the same sadness and disillusionment, now this mass is beginning to enter conclusively into its own history, is beginning to write it with its own blood, is beginning to suffer and die for it.

Because now in the fields and mountains of America, on its slopes and prairies and in its jungles, in the wilderness or in the traffic of cities, this world is beginning with full cause to erupt. Anxious hands are stretched forth, ready to die for what is theirs, to win those rights which were laughed at by one and all for 500 years. Yes, now history will have to take the poor of America into account, the exploited and spurned of Latin America, who have decided to begin writing history for themselves for all time. Already they can be seen on the roads, on foot, day after day, in endless marches of hundreds of kilometers to the governmental "eminences," to obtain their rights.

Already they can be seen armed with stones, sticks, machetes, in one direction and another, each day, occupying lands, sinking hooks into the land which belongs to them and defending it with their lives. They can be seen carrying signs, slogans, flags; letting them flap in the mountain or prairie winds. And the wave of anger, of demands for justice, of claims for rights, which is beginning to sweep the lands of Latin America, will not stop. That wave will swell with every passing day. For that wave is composed of the greatest number, the majorities in every respect, those whose labor amasses the wealth and turns the wheels of history. Now, they are awakening from the long, brutalizing sleep to which they had been subjected.

For this great humanity has said, "enough!" and has begun to march. And their giant march will not be halted until they conquer true independence for which they have vainly died more than once. Today, however, those who die will die like the Cubans at Playa Giron. They will die for their own true and never to be surrendered independence.

*Patria o Muerte! Venceremos!*

THE PEOPLE OF CUBA Havana, Cuba Free Territory of America  
February 4, 1962

## Guerilla Warfare: A Method, 1963

Ernesto “Che” Guevara, an Argentinean medic born in 1928, is one of the greatest symbols of the Cuban Revolution and the revolution in general. After his long journey through Latin America, he met with Fidel Castro and his group in Mexico. Castro left Cuba after amnesty was announced by the Batista regime in 1955. Guevara and Castro shared the same visions of injustice and the necessity of the fight against imperialism and the exploitation of Latin America. This common view on the surrounding reality united them in their actions. Together, they organized a military operation of invading Cuba by the guerilla group. This is how the Cuban revolution began.

For both of them, the victorious revolution in Cuba was only the beginning of the changes implemented not only on the island but also in other countries. Although their ways parted as they had different visions of building a revolutionary order, they still were strongly engaged in the spreading of the revolution. Ernesto Guevara gained experience in the revolutionary struggle in Africa and Latin American countries. He used this experience to formulate his theory of guerilla warfare. He saw it as a mean to successful fight against imperialist powers. In 1963, he wrote an article that was originally published in *Cuba Socialista* in September 1963. In the article, “Che” Guevara explained the fundamental rules of the guerilla warfare and expressed his opinion that in the reality of Latin America, this is one of the best instruments of the successful struggle against capitalism and imperialism. The *foco* theory was one of the principle assumptions of guerilla warfare by Ernesto “Che” Guevara. He personally tried to use the “foco” theory in practice after he left Cuba to fight guerilla warfare in Bolivia in 1966. After nearly a year of building a revolutionary “focus”, he was captured by the Bolivian army and killed on October 9, 1967. In the next years a lot of guerilla movements used Guevara’s theory of guerilla warfare as a handbook on how to organize a guerilla movement and how to carry out a revolution.

### Guerilla Warfare: A Method, Ernesto “Che” Guevara, 1963

Source: [www.sojust.net/essays/che\\_guerrilla\\_warfare.html](http://www.sojust.net/essays/che_guerrilla_warfare.html) (10.10.2013)

Guerrilla warfare has been employed on innumerable occasions throughout history in different circumstances, to achieve different aims. Of late it has been used in various people’s wars of liberation when the vanguard of the people chose the path of irregular armed struggle against enemies of greater military power. Asia, Africa and America have been the scene of such actions when trying to attain power in the struggle against feudal, neo-colonial or colonial exploitation. In Europe, guerrilla warfare was used as supplementary to their own or allied regular armies.

Guerrilla warfare has been waged many times in America. As a case in point closer to home the experience of Augusto César Sandino fighting against the Yankee expeditionary force on the banks of the Segovia in Nicaragua can be noted, and recently Cuba's revolutionary war. Since then in America the problems of guerrilla warfare have become a question for theoretical discussions for the continent's progressive parties, and whether it is possible or expedient to use it, has become the subject of head-on controversial discussions. This article will try to present our views on guerrilla warfare and how to use it correctly.

Above all, it must be made clear that this form of struggle is a means – means to an end. That end, essential and inevitable for all revolutionaries, is the winning of political power. Therefore, in analysing specific situations in different countries in America one must use the concept of guerrilla warfare in the limited sense of a method of struggle in order to gain that end.

(...)

We consider that the Cuban Revolution made three fundamental contributions to the laws of the revolutionary movement in the current situation in America. They are: Firstly, people's forces can win a war against the army. Secondly, we need not always wait for all the revolutionary conditions to be present; the insurrection itself can create them. Thirdly, in the underdeveloped parts of America the battleground for armed struggle should in the main be the countryside.

(...)

The initial struggle of small fighting units is constantly nurtured by new forces; the mass movement begins to grow bold, the old order bit by bit breaks up into a thousand pieces and that is when the working class and the urban masses decide the battle.

What is it that from the very beginning of the fight makes those units invincible, regardless of the number, strength and resources of their enemies? It is the people's support, and they can count on an ever-increasing mass support.

But the peasantry is a class which, because of the ignorance in which it has been kept and the isolation in which it lives, requires the revolutionary and political leadership of the working class and the revolutionary intellectuals. Without that it cannot alone launch the struggle and achieve victory.

In the present historical conditions of Latin America the national bourgeoisie cannot lead the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist struggle. Experience demonstrates that in our nations this class – even when its interests clash with those of Yankee imperialism – has been incapable of confronting imperialism, paralysed by fear of social revolution and frightened by the clamour of the exploited masses.

(...)

At present there is in America a state of unstable balance between oligarchic dictatorship and popular pressure. By "oligarchic" we mean the reactionary alliance between the bourgeoisie and the landlord class of each country with a greater or lesser preponderance of feudalism. These dictatorships continue within certain frameworks of legality, which they set up for themselves to facilitate their work during the whole unrestricted period of their class domination, while we are undergoing a stage in which the pressure of the people is very strong and is knocking at the doors of bourgeois legality which its own authors have to violate in order to cheek the impetus of the masses.

The barefaced violations of all established legislation – or of legislation especially instituted to sanction their deeds – only heighten the tension of the people's forces. The oligarchic dictatorship, therefore, endeavours to use the old legal order to change constitutionality and further suppress the proletariat without a head-on clash. Nevertheless, this is just where a contradiction arises. The people now do not tolerate the old, still less



the new, coercive measures adopted by the dictatorship, and try to smash them. We must never forget the authoritarian and restrictive class character of the bourgeois state. Lenin refers to it thus:

"The state is the product and the manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms. The state arises when, where, and to the extent that class antagonisms objectively cannot be reconciled. And, conversely, the existence of the state proves that the class antagonisms are irreconcilable."

In other words, we must not allow the word democracy, used in an apologetic manner to represent the dictatorship of the exploiting classes, to lose its deeper meaning and acquire the meaning of giving the people certain liberties, more or less good. To struggle only to restore a certain degree of bourgeois legality, without at the same time raising the question of revolutionary power, is to struggle for the return of a certain dictatorial order established by the dominant social classes; it is only a struggle for a lighter ball to be fixed to the convict's chains.

(...)

In these conditions of conflict, the oligarchy breaks its own contracts, its own mask of "democracy," and attacks the people, although it always tries to make use of the superstructure it has formed for oppression. At that moment, the question again arises: What is to be done? Our answer is: Violence is not only for the use of the exploiters; the exploited can use it too, and what is more, ought to use it at the opportune moment. Martí said: "He who wages war in a country that can avoid it is a criminal; so is he who fails to wage a war that cannot be avoided."

(...)

That is to say, we should not be afraid of violence, the midwife of new societies; only such violence should be unleashed precisely at the moment when the people's leaders find circumstances most favourable.

What will these be? Subjectively, they depend upon two factors that are complementary and that in turn deepen in the course of the struggle: the consciousness of the necessity of change and the certainty of the possibility of this revolutionary change. These two factors, coupled with the objective conditions – which in nearly all of America are highly favourable for the development of struggle with the firm will to attain it as well as the new correlation of forces in the world, determine the form of action.

However far away the socialist countries may be, their favourable influence will make itself felt among the fighting peoples who will be given more strength by their enlightening example. On the 26<sup>th</sup> of July this year (1963), Fidel Castro said:

„And the duty of the revolutionaries, especially at this moment, is to know how to recognise and how to take advantage of the changes in the correlation of forces which have taken place in the world, and to understand that these changes facilitate the struggle of the peoples. The duty of revolutionaries, of Latin American revolutionaries, is not to wait for the change in the correlation of forces to produce a miracle of social revolutions in Latin America, but to take full advantage of everything in it that is favourable to the revolutionary movement – and to make revolution!"

(...)

In elaborating the thesis, we have assumed that eventually the idea of armed struggle as well as the formula of guerrilla warfare as a method of fighting will be accepted. Why do we think that guerrilla warfare is the correct way in the present situation in America? There are fundamental arguments which in our opinion determine the necessity of guerrilla action as the central axis of the struggle in America. First, accepting as true that the enemy will struggle to maintain itself in power, it is necessary to consider destroying the oppressor – army. To do this, it is necessary to confront it with a people's army. This

army is not born spontaneously; it must be armed from the enemy's arsenal and this demands a long hard struggle in which the people's forces and their leaders will always be exposed to attack by superior forces and be without adequate conditions of defence and manoeuvrability.

On the other hand, the guerrilla nucleus, established in areas suitable for fighting, ensures the security and continuity of the revolutionary command. The urban forces commanded by the general staff of the people's army can perform actions of the utmost importance. But the eventual destruction of these groups would not kill the soul of the revolution, its leadership. This would continue to spark the revolutionary spirit of the masses from its rural stronghold, organising new forces for other battles.

Moreover, in this area begins the construction of the future state apparatus entrusted with leading the class dictatorship efficiently during the whole period of transition. The longer the struggle, the greater and more complicated the administrative problems, and to solve them cadres will be trained for the difficult task of consolidating power and economic development at a later stage.

Secondly, the general situation of the Latin American peasantry and the increasingly explosive character of its struggle against feudal rule in the framework of an alliance between local and foreign exploiters.

(...)

What is Yankee imperialism's attitude confronting the objective and historically inexorable reality of the Latin American revolution? To prepare to fight a colonial war against the peoples of Latin America; to create an apparatus of force to establish the political pretexts and the pseudo-legal instruments underwritten by the representatives of the reactionary oligarchies, in order to curb, by blood and by iron, the struggle of the Latin American peoples.

This objective situation demonstrates the latent, unused strength in our peasants and the necessity to utilise it for the liberation of America. Thirdly, the continental character of the struggle.

Could this new stage of the emancipation of America be conceived as a confrontation of two local forces struggling for power in a given territory? Hardly. The struggle between all the forces of the people and all the forces of repression will be a struggle to the death. This too is forecast by the passages quoted above.

The Yankees will intervene because of solidarity of interests and because the struggle in America is decisive. In fact, they are already intervening in the preparation of repressive forces and the organisation of a continental apparatus of struggle. But from now on they will do so with all their energy; they will strike the people's forces with all the destructive weapons at their disposal. They will try to prevent the consolidation of revolutionary power; and if it should be successful anywhere, they will renew their attack. They will not recognise it. They will try to divide the revolutionary forces. They will introduce all types of saboteurs, create frontier problems, engage other reactionary states to oppose it, and will try to strangle the new state economically—in a word, to annihilate it.

(...)

Let us consider the way a guerrilla centre can start.

Nuclei of relatively few persons choose places favourable for guerrilla warfare, sometimes with the intention of launching a counter-attack or to weather a storm, and there they begin to take action. But the following must be made clear: At the beginning, the relative weakness of the guerrilla fighters is such that they should only endeavour to pay attention to the terrain in order to become acquainted with the surroundings, establish connections with the population and fortify the places which eventually will be converted into bases.

A guerrilla unit can survive only if it starts by basing its development on the three following conditions: constant mobility, constant vigilance, constant wariness. Without the adequate use of these elements of military tactics, the unit will find it hard to survive. It must be remembered that the heroism of the guerrilla fighter at such times consists in the scope of the planned objective and the long series of sacrifices that must be made in order to attain it.

(...)

The guerrillas will perhaps suffer heavily from the attacks of enemy armies, at times be split up while those taken prisoner will be martyred. They will be pursued like hunted animals in the areas they have chosen to operate in, with the constant anxiety of having the enemy on their track, and on top of all this with the constant doubt that in some cases the terrorised peasants will give them away to the repressive troops in order to save their own skins. They have no alternative but death or victory at times when death is a concept a thousand times present, and victory a myth only a revolutionary can dream of.

That is the heroism of the guerrilla. That is why it is said that to be on the march is also a form of fighting, and to avoid combat at a given moment is another form. Faced with the general superiority of the enemy, the way to act is to find a form of tactics with which to gain a relative superiority at a chosen point, either by being able to concentrate more troops than the enemy or by making the best use of the terrain to secure advantages that upset the correlation of forces. In these conditions tactical victory is assured; if relative superiority is not clear, it is preferable not to take action. As long as one is in a position to choose the "how" and the "when," no battle should be fought which will not end in victory.

Guerrilla forces will grow and be consolidated within the framework of the great politico-military action of which they are a part. And within this framework they will go on forming the bases, which are essential for their success. These bases are points which the enemy can penetrate only at the cost of heavy losses; they are bastions of the revolution, both shelters and starting points for bolder and more distant raids.

Such a time will come if the difficulties of both tactical and political discipline have been overcome. The guerrillas must never forget their function as vanguard of the people, the mandate entrusted to their care, and therefore they should create the necessary political conditions for the establishment of a revolutionary power based on the full support of the masses. The main demands of the peasantry should be met to the degree and in the form which circumstances permit, so as to bring about the unity and solidarity of the whole population. If the military situation is difficult from the first moments, the political situation will be no less delicate; and if a single military error can wipe out the guerrillas, a political error can check their development for a long period.

(...)

In the course of its growth guerrilla fighting reaches a point at which its capacity for action covers a given region, for which there are too many men and too great a concentration. Then begins the beehive action, in which one of the commanding officers, a distinguished guerrilla, hops to another region and repeats the chain development of guerrilla warfare, but still subject to a central command.

(...)

The guerrilla war or war of liberation will generally have three stages: First, the strategic defensive when a small force nibbles at the enemy and makes off, not to shelter in passive defence within a small circumference, but rather to defend itself by limited attacks which it can carry out successfully. After this, comes a state of equilibrium, during which the possibilities of action on the part of both the enemy and the guerrillas are established; then comes the final stage of overrunning the repressive army, ending in the

capture of the big cities, large-scale decisive encounters and the total annihilation of the enemy.

After reaching a state of equilibrium, when both sides are on guard against each other, in the ensuing development guerrilla war acquires new characteristics. The concept of manoeuvre is introduced: big columns attack strong points; and mobile warfare with the shifting of forces and of considerable means of attack. But owing to the capacity of resistance and counter-attack that the enemy still retains, this war of manoeuvre does not entirely replace guerrilla fighting; it is only one form of action taken by the larger guerrilla forces until finally they crystallise into a people's army with army corps. Even at this time, the guerrillas will play their "original" guerrilla role, moving ahead of the actions of the main forces, destroying communications and sabotaging the whole defensive apparatus of the enemy.

We have predicted that the war will be continental. This means it will be protracted; it will have many fronts, and will cost much blood and countless lives over a long period. But besides this, the phenomena of polarisation of forces that are occurring in America, the clear division between exploiters and exploited that will exist in future revolutionary war, mean that when the armed vanguard of the people seizes power, the country or countries that attain it will, at one and the same time, liquidate both their imperialist and national exploiting class oppressor. The first stage of the socialist revolution will have crystallised; the people will be ready to staunch their wounds and begin to build socialism.

Will there be other possibilities less bloody?

Some time ago, there took place the last dividing up of the world, in which the United States took the lion's share of our continent; today the imperialists of the Old World are developing anew, and the might of the European Common Market is threatening the United States itself. All this might lead to the belief that it will be possible to watch as spectators the inter-imperialist struggle in order to attain further advances, perhaps in alliance with the stronger national bourgeoisie. Apart from the consideration that in class struggle a passive policy never brings good results and that alliances with the bourgeoisie, however revolutionary they may appear at a given moment, have only a transitory character, the time factor will induce us to take another path. The sharpening of the fundamental contradiction in America appears to be so rapid that it upsets the "normal" development of the contradictions within the imperialist camp in its struggle for markets. The national bourgeoisie is for the most part united with United States imperialism and has to throw in its lot with the latter in each country. Even cases of agreements or coincidences of contradictions between the U.S. and the national bourgeoisie and other imperialists happen within the framework of a fundamental struggle that in the course of its development inevitably embraces all the exploited and all the exploiters. The polarisation of antagonistic forces among class enemies is so far more rapid than the development of the contradictions among exploiters over the division of the spoils. There are two camps: the alternative becomes clearer for every individual and for every particular stratum of the population.

The Alliance for Progress is a design to check what cannot be checked.

But if the advance of the European Common Market, or any other imperialist group on the American market, were more rapid than the development of the fundamental contradiction, the people's forces would only have to be introduced as a wedge into the open breach, carrying on this whole struggle and utilising the new intruders with a clear consciousness of their final intentions.

Not a single position, not a single weapon, not a single secret, should be given up to the class enemy, under penalty of losing all.

The eruption of the struggle in America has actually begun. Will its storm centre be in Venezuela, Guatemala, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador? Are these present skirmishes only

a manifestation of a restlessness that has not come to fruition? It does not matter what will be the result of today's struggles. It does not matter, so far as the final result is concerned, whether one or another movement is temporarily defeated. What is certain is the determination to struggle which ripens day by day, the consciousness of the necessity for revolutionary change, the certainty that it is possible.

This is a prediction. We make it with the conviction that history will prove us right. An analysis of the subjective and objective factors in America and in the imperialist world points to us the accuracy of these assertions based on the Second Declaration of Havana.

## The National Security of All the Americas Is at Stake in Central America

After the presidential term of Jimmy Carter that put a strong emphasis on human rights and looking for new forms of US Latin American policy, the administration of Ronald Reagan perceived Central America as a crucial element of its Latin American activity. It fully introduced recommendations proposed by Jean Kirkpatrick and other advisers. Ronald Reagan decided to use military instruments if necessary. For him, the main struggle between communism and the "democratic free world" was taking place in Central America. This is why, according to him, the containment of leftist guerillas in El Salvador and the overthrow of the Sandinista government in Nicaragua constituted priorities for US foreign policy. According to President Reagan, the conflicts in Central America were directly inspired and fueled by the Cuban communist government and the Soviet Union. He perceived the situation in the region as a direct threat to US national security. In many speeches, President Reagan emphasized the importance of the Central American region for the United States and the danger that the situation in the isthmus constituted for the United States. None of the former US presidents dedicated so many public speeches to Central America as Ronald Reagan. Below is one of Reagan's most important addresses related to the situation in Central America. It was delivered to a Joint Session of Congress.

The National Security of All the Americas Is at Stake in Central America, Address by President Reagan to a Joint Session of the Congress, April 27, 1983

Source: <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1983/42783d.htm>  
(3.12.2013)

American Foreign Policy. Current Documents – 1983, The United States Department of State Historical Office, p. 1320

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished Members of the Congress, honored guests, and my fellow Americans:

A number of times in past years, Members of Congress and a President have come together in meetings like this to resolve a crisis. I have asked for this meeting in the hope that we can prevent one.

It would be hard to find many Americans who aren't aware of our stake in the Middle East, the Persian Gulf, or the NATO line dividing the free world from the Communist bloc. And the same could be said for Asia.

But in spite of, or maybe because of, a flurry of stories about places like Nicaragua and El Salvador and, yes, some concerted propaganda, many of us find it hard to believe we have a stake in problems involving those countries. Too many have thought of Central America as just that place way down below Mexico that can't possibly constitute a threat to our well-being. And that's why I've asked for this session. Central America's problems do directly affect the security and the well-being of our own people. And Central America is much closer to the United States than many of the world troublespots that concern us. So, we work to restore our own economy; we cannot afford to lose sight of our neighbors to the south.

El Salvador is nearer to Texas than Texas is to Massachusetts. Nicaragua is just as close to Miami, San Antonio, San Diego, and Tucson as those cities are to Washington, where we're gathered tonight.

But nearness on the map doesn't even begin to tell the strategic importance of Central America, bordering as it does on the Caribbean – our lifeline to the outside world. Two-thirds of all our foreign trade and petroleum pass through the Panama Canal and the Caribbean. In a European crisis at least half of our supplies for NATO would go through these areas by sea. It's well to remember that in early 1942, a handful of Hitler's submarines sank more tonnage there than in all of the Atlantic Ocean. And they did this without a single naval base anywhere in the area. And today, the situation is different. Cuba is host to a Soviet combat brigade, a submarine base capable of servicing Soviet submarines, and military air bases visited regularly by Soviet military aircraft.

Because of its importance, the Caribbean Basin is a magnet for adventurism. We're all aware of the Libyan cargo planes refueling in Brazil a few days ago on their way to deliver "medical supplies" to Nicaragua. Brazilian authorities discovered the so-called medical supplies were actually munitions and prevented their delivery.

You may remember that last month, speaking on national television, I showed an aerial photo of an airfield being built on the island of Grenada. Well, if that airfield had been completed, those planes could have refueled there and completed their journey.

If the Nazis during World War II and the Soviets today could recognize the Caribbean and Central America as vital to our interests, shouldn't we, also? For several years now, under two administrations, the United States has been increasing its defense of freedom in the Caribbean Basin. And I can tell you tonight, democracy is beginning to take root in El Salvador, which, until a short time ago, knew only dictatorship.

(...)

If Central America were to fall, what would the consequences be for our position in Asia, Europe, and for alliances such as NATO? If the United States cannot respond to a threat near our own borders, why should Europeans or Asians believe that we're seriously concerned about threats to them? If the Soviets can assume that nothing short of an actual attack on the United States will provoke an American response, which ally, which friend will trust us then?

(...)

We will pursue four basic goals in Central America:

First, in response to decades of inequity and indifference, we will support democracy, reform, and human freedom. This means using our assistance, our powers of persuasion, and our legitimate leverage to bolster humane democratic systems where they already exist and to help countries on their way to that goal complete the process as quickly as human institutions can be changed. Elections in El Salvador and also in Nicaragua must be open to all, fair and safe. The international community must help. We will work at human rights problems, not walk away from them.

Second, in response to the challenge of world recession and, in the case of El Salvador, to the unrelenting campaign of economic sabotage by the guerrillas, we will support economic development. And by a margin of 2 to 1 our aid is economic now, not military. Seventy-seven cents out of every dollar we will spend in the area this year goes for food, fertilizers, and other essentials for economic growth and development. And our economic program goes beyond traditional aid. The Caribbean Initiative introduced in the House earlier today will provide powerful trade and investment incentives to help these countries achieve self-sustaining economic growth without exporting U.S. jobs. Our goal must be to focus our immense and growing technology to enhance health care, agriculture, industry, and to ensure that we who inhabit this interdependent region come to know and understand each other better, retaining our diverse identities, respecting our diverse traditions and institutions.

And, third, in response to the military challenge from Cuba and Nicaragua – to their deliberate use of force to spread tyranny – we will support the security of the region's threatened nations. We do not view security assistance as an end in itself, but as a shield for democratization, economic development, and diplomacy. No amount of reform will bring peace so long as guerrillas believe they will win by force. No amount of economic help will suffice if guerrilla units can destroy roads and bridges and power stations and crops, again and again, with impunity. But with better training and material help, our neighbors can hold off the guerrillas and give democratic reform time to take root.

And, fourth, we will support dialog and negotiations both among the countries of the region and within each country. The terms and conditions of participation in elections are negotiable. Costa Rica is a shining example of democracy. Honduras has made the move from military rule to democratic government. Guatemala is pledged to the same course. The United States will work toward a political solution in Central America which will serve the interests of the democratic process.

(...)

In summation, I say to you that tonight there can be no question: The national security of all the Americas is at stake in Central America. If we cannot defend ourselves there, we cannot expect to prevail elsewhere. Our credibility would collapse, our alliances would crumble, and the safety of our homeland would be put in jeopardy.

We have a vital interest, a moral duty, and a solemn responsibility. This is not a partisan issue. It is a question of our meeting our moral responsibility to ourselves, our friends, and our posterity. It is a duty that falls on all of us – the President, the Congress, and the people. We must perform it together. Who among us would wish to bear responsibility for failing to meet our shared obligation?

Thank you, God bless you, and good night.





## Chapter Eight

# **The End of the Cold War and Democratization**

The promotion of democracy and the economic development of countries became the new foundations of US Latin American policy after the end of the Cold War. As the ideological aspect of these relations lost its importance, and most of the countries of the region decided to transform their economies according to the neoliberal model strongly supported by the United States, a good basis for a new opening in the mutual relations appeared. It was first defined and presented in the George H. W. Bush's proposal of the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. It was particularly important to convince Latin American and Caribbean leaders that US diplomacy no longer thinks in the Cold War manner. The American government's return to the roots of its foreign policy based on the promotion of democracy could be observed. This was carried out, in various periods, with the help of different instruments, including military intervention and interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Since the end of the Cold War the George H. W. Bush's administration was trying to reach the main objectives of US policy toward Latin American and Caribbean countries through cooperation. In the 1990s, the United States participated in a majority of initiatives aimed at the promotion and protection of democracy. It was the United States that strongly opposed – hand in hand with other Latin American and Caribbean countries – anti-democratic tendencies in Peru and Guatemala.

Since establishment of democratic regime in the countries of the region became one of the priorities of the United States after the Cold War, there was a desire among some politicians to use all the instruments necessary to do just that. When Bill Clinton assumed power, he was deeply convinced that the economic development of Mexico would also serve to democratize the Mexican political system. This is why US's acceptance of the Mexican initiative to liberalize commerce in North America should be perceived not only from the economic point of view. However, the economic aspect of the North American Free Trade Agreement is the most important one. It gave an impulse for other, much broader ideas of economic cooperation between the United States and Latin American and Caribbean region.

## The Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, 1990

The end of the Ronald Reagan administration brought significant changes in US foreign policy. This was the effect of the changing international situation, the crisis of the socialist block and the end of the Cold War competition between two antagonist superpowers but also another attitude toward international relations presented by the new US President, George H. W. Bush. The revaluation in the sphere of foreign policy that was brought about by the Bush administration had a significant impact on US Latin American policy. First, the Bush administration ended with a strongly ideological attitude toward Latin American countries. Second, it placed greater attention to the changes that were taking place in those countries, principally the democratization of the political systems and economic liberalization. Also, the new administration decided to lessen the role of the military and political instruments of the US Latin American policy and increase the role of economic ones.

The significant example of the United States' authorities' new attitude toward the Latin American region was the new initiative announced by George H. W. Bush in June 1990. One of the elements of this program was the idea of the Free Trade Area of the Americas. In his speech on June 27, 1990 President Bush talked about the new pillars of the US Latin American policy: commerce, investments and financial debt. This new initiative presented by the George H. W. Bush administration was warmly commented by the Latin American leaders. However, in fact, the US Latin American policy was highly incoherent. With the growing interest in economic cooperation and integration, the US administration still did not want to resign from military instruments as for example the military intervention that was used to oust Panama dictator Manuel Noriega.

### Remarks Announcing the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, June 27, 1990

Source: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=18644#axzz2hmTUKCsu> (15.10.2013)

(...)

In the past 12 months, every one of us, from the man in the White House to the man on the street, has been fascinated by the tremendous changes, the positive changes, taking place around the world. Freedom has made great gains not just in Eastern Europe but right here in the Americas; and we've seen a resurgence of democratic rule, a rising tide of democracy, never before witnessed in the history of this beloved hemisphere. And with one exception, Cuba, the transition to democracy is moving towards completion, and we can all sense the excitement that the day is not far off when Cuba joins the ranks of world democracies and makes the Americas fully free.

With one exception, that's the case. But the political transformation sweeping the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean has its parallel in the economic sphere. Throughout the region, nations are turning away from the statist economic policies that stifle growth and are now looking to the power of the free market to help this hemisphere realize its un-

tapped potential for progress. A new leadership has emerged, backed by the strength of the people's mandate, leadership that understands that the future of Latin America lies with free government and free markets. In the words of Colombia's courageous leader, Virgilio Barco – President Barco: "The long-running match between Karl Marx and Adam Smith is finally coming to an end" with the "recognition that open economies with access to markets can lead to social progress."

For the United States, these are welcome developments, developments that we're eager to support. But we recognize that each nation in the region must make its own choices. There is no blueprint, no one-size-fits-all approach, to reform. The primary responsibility for achieving economic growth lies with each individual country. Our challenge in this country is to respond in ways that support the positive changes now taking place in the hemisphere. We must forge a genuine partnership for free-market reform.

Back in February, I met in Cartagena [Colombia] with heads of the three Andean nations, and I came away from that meeting convinced that the U.S. must review its approach not only to that region but to Latin America and the Caribbean as a whole. And I asked Treasury Secretary Brady to lead a review of U.S. economic policy towards this vital region, to make a fresh assessment, if you will, of the problems and opportunities we'll encounter in the decade ahead. And that review is now complete, and the results are in, and the need for new economic initiatives is clear and compelling.

All signs point to the fact that we must shift the focus of our economic interaction towards a new economic partnership because prosperity in our hemisphere depends on trade, not aid. And I've asked you here today to share with you some of the ideas, some of the ways we can build a broad-based partnership for the nineties – to announce the new Enterprise for the Americas Initiative that creates incentives to reinforce Latin America's growing recognition that free-market reform is the key to sustained growth and political stability.

The three pillars of our new initiative are trade, investment, and debt. To expand trade, I propose that we begin the process of creating a hemispherewide free trade zone; to increase investment, that we adopt measures to create a new flow of capital into the region; and to further ease the burden of debt, a new approach to debt in the region with important benefits for our environment.

(...)

First, as we enter the final months of the current Uruguay round of the world trade talks, I pledge close cooperation with the nations of this hemisphere. The successful completion of the Uruguay round remains the most effective way of promoting long-term trade growth in Latin America and the increased integration of Latin nations into the overall global trading system. Our aim in the Uruguay round is free and fair trade, and through these talks we are seeking to strengthen existing trade rules and to expand them to areas that do not now have agreed rules of fairplay. And to show our commitment to our neighbors in Latin America and the Caribbean, we will seek deeper tariff reductions in this round on products of special interest to them.

Second, we must build on the trend we see toward free markets and make our ultimate aim a free trade system that links all of the Americas: North, Central, and South. And we look forward to the day when not only are the Americas the first fully free, democratic hemisphere but when all are equal partners in a free trade zone stretching from the port of Anchorage to the Tierra del Fuego.

(...)

Promoting free trade is just one of three key elements in our new Enterprise for the Americas Initiative. And our second pillar is increased investment.

The competition for capital today is fierce, and the key to increased investment is to be competitive, to turn around the conditions that have discouraged both foreign and do-

mestic investment – reduce the regulatory burden, clear away the thicket of bureaucratic barriers that choke off Latin America's aspiring entrepreneurs.

(...)

First, the United States will work with the Inter-American Development Bank to create a new lending program for nations that take significant steps to remove impediments to international investment. The World Bank could also contribute to this effort.

And second, we propose the creation of a new investment fund for the Americas. This fund, administered by the IDB, could provide up to \$300 million a year in grants in response to market-oriented investment reforms in progress in privatization. The U.S. intends to contribute \$100 million to the fund, and we will seek matching contributions from Europe and Japan.

But in order to create an attractive climate for new investment, we must build on our successful efforts to ease the debt burden. That's the third pillar of this new Enterprise for the Americas Initiative.

(...)

Our debt reduction program will deal separately with concessional and commercial types of loans. On the concessional debt, loans made from AID or Food for Peace accounts, we will propose substantial debt reductions for the most heavily burdened countries. And we will also sell a portion of outstanding commercial loans to facilitate these debt-for-equity and debt-for-nature swaps in countries that have set up such programs. These actions will be taken on a case-by-case basis.

One measure of prosperity and the most important long-term investment any nation can make is environmental well-being. As part of our Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, we will take action to strengthen environmental policies in this hemisphere. Debt-for-nature swaps are one example, patterned after the innovative agreements reached by some Latin American nations and their commercial creditors. We will also call for the creation of environmental trusts, where interest payments owed on restructured U.S. debt will be paid in local currency and set aside to fund environmental projects in the debtor countries.

(...)

## The Santiago Declaration and the Mechanism of Defending Democracy in America, 1991

The last two decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century were crucial for contemporary Latin America and its relations with the United States. As non-democratic regimes discredited themselves in effect of their inability in economic recovering, the wave of democratization also reached the Latin American region. As a result, most countries resigned from different non-democratic forms of government and started the difficult process of democratization. The United States was deeply engaged in the process of building democratic regimes in Latin America. This is one of the most important changes of the US Latin American

policy. The US stopped supporting authoritarian regimes in the name of ideology and started supporting the building of the democratic political systems in the name of the promotion of democracy.

As the process of creating democratic regimes in the region where non-democratic tradition is so strong, the process required not only the firm internal determination of all the political actors but also multilateral cooperation at the regional level. The Organization of American States, constituting the basis of the Inter-American System showed strong support for the process of democratization in Latin American and Caribbean. After the end of the Cold War, the role of the OAS also changed. With a smaller US ideological engagement in hemispheric affairs, the OAS gained more independence in its activity. Although, the United States still have a very important voice in the Organization, the Latin American and Caribbean countries have a little bit more independence in their initiatives at the OAS forum. Additionally, the positive attitude of the United States toward the strengthening of the democratization process in the region helped to work out a declaration that is one of the most important voices of the OAS and its members in favor of democracy. Its adoption helped Guatemala and Peru, to name but a few, in preventing undemocratic breakdowns. It also confirmed the most important rule of the inter-American system which is non-intervention in the internal affairs of the states.

During the same meeting in Santiago de Chile, June 1991, the General Assembly of the OAS decided to formulate a precise mechanism of defending democratic regimes in the event of any attempts to question them or any efforts to implement any unconstitutional changes in the American countries. This mechanism was presented in the *Resolution 1080 on Representative Democracy*. It was used during the Jorge Serrano attempt of *autogolpe* in Guatemala in 1993 and in Peru after Alberto Fujimori dissolved the parliament.

### Santiago Commitment to Democracy and the Renewal of the Inter-American System (Santiago Declaration), 1991

Source: [www.iidh.ed.cr/BibliotecaWeb/](http://www.iidh.ed.cr/BibliotecaWeb/) (21.01.2014)

The Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegation or the member states of the Organization of American States, meeting in Santiago, Chile, as the representatives of their democratically elected governments to the twenty-first regular session of the General Assembly of the OAS;

Aware that profound international political and economic changes and the end of the cold war open up new opportunities and responsibilities for concerted action by all countries through global and regional organizations, as well as in their bilateral relationships;

Bearing in mind that the changes towards a more open and democratic international system are not completely established, and that therefore, cooperation must be encouraged and strengthened so that those favorable trends may continue;

(...)

Reaffirming that the principles enshrined in the OAS Charter and the ideals of peace, democracy, social justice, comprehensive development and solidarity are the permanent foundation of the inter-American system;

Recognizing that cooperation to guarantee the peace and security of the hemisphere is one of the essential purposes consecrated in the Charter of the Organization of American States (OAS), and that the proliferation of arms adversely affects international security and takes resources away from the economic and social development of the peoples of the member states;

(...)

Noting with interest the report of the consultation group on the renewal of the inter-American system; and Convinced that the OAS is the political forum for dialogue, understanding, and cooperation among all the countries of the hemisphere, whose potential, enhanced by the admission of new member states, must be increased to make it an effective voice in the world for the decisions of its members,

**DECLARE:**

Their inescapable commitment to the defense and promotion of representative democracy and human rights in the region, within the framework of respect for the principles of self-determination and non-intervention;

Their firm resolve to stimulate the process of renewal of the Organization of American States, to make it more effective and useful in the application of its guiding principles and for the attainment of its objectives;

Their determination to continue to prepare and develop a relevant agenda for the Organization, in order to respond appropriately to the new challenges and demands in the world and in the region, and their decision to assign special priority on that agenda, during the present decade, to the following actions:

- a. Intensifying the common struggle and cooperative action against extreme poverty to help reduce economic and social inequalities in the hemisphere, and thereby strengthen the promotion and consolidation of democracy in the region;
- b. Strengthening representative democracy as an expression of the legitimate and free manifestation of the will of the people, always respecting the sovereignty and independence of member states;
- c. Promoting the observance and defense of human rights in accordance with the inter-American instruments in force and through the specific existing agencies; and ensuring that no form of discrimination becomes an obstacle to political participation by undervalued or minority ethnic groups;
- d. Promoting the progressive liberalization of trade and the, expansion of investments, access to scientific and technological knowledge, and the reduction of the foreign debt of the countries, of the region and, from this perspective, support for the "Enterprise for the Americas Initiative" and the Uruguay Round of the GATT negotiations;
- e. Contributing to the protection of our environment by all for the benefit of present and future generations, thus assuring sustainable development in the region;
- f. Encouraging the adoption and execution of appropriate measures to prevent and combat the illicit use and production of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances, and traffic therein, chemical precursors and money laundering, and related clandestine traffic in arms, ammunitions, and explosives;
- g. Favoring integration processes in the region and, to this end, adopting a program of work designed, inter alia, to harmonize legislation in the region, particularly that of the civil and common law systems;

h. Promoting and intensifying cultural, educational, scientific, and technological exchanges as instruments for integration, with full respect for the cultural heritage of each of the member states;

i. Increasing technical cooperation and encouraging a transfer of technology to enhance the capabilities for economic growth of the countries in the region.

Their decision to initiate a process of consultation on hemispheric security in light of the new conditions in the region and the world, from an updated and comprehensive perspective of security and disarmament, including the subject of all forms of proliferation of weapons and instruments of mass destruction, so that the largest possible volume of resources may be devoted to the economic and social development of the member states; and an appeal to other competent organizations in the world to join in the efforts of the OAS.

Their decision to adopt efficacious, timely, and expeditious procedures to ensure the promotion and defense of representative democracy, in keeping with the Charter of the Organization of American States.

Consequently, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs and the Heads of Delegation of the member states of the OAS, in the name of their peoples, declare their firm political commitment to the promotion and protection of human rights and representative democracy, as indispensable conditions for the stability, peace, and development of the region, and for the success of the changes and renewal that the inter-American system will require at the threshold of the twenty-first century.

#### AG/RES. 1080 (XXI-O/91) Representative Democracy (Resolution adopted at the fifth plenary session, held on June 5, 1991)

Source: <http://www.oas.org/juridico/english/agres1080.htm> (15.10.2013)

#### **WHEREAS:**

The Preamble of the Charter of the OAS establishes that representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace, and development of the region;

Under the provisions of the Charter, one of the basic purposes of the OAS is to promote and consolidate representative democracy, with due respect for the principle of non-intervention;

Due respect must be accorded to the policies of each member country in regard to the recognition of states and governments;

In view of the widespread existence of democratic governments in the Hemisphere, the principle, enshrined in the Charter, that the solidarity of the American states and the high aims which it pursues require the political organization of those states to be based on effective exercise of representative democracy must be made operative; and

The region still faces serious political, social, and economic problems that may threaten the stability of democratic governments,

## THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

### RESOLVES:

1. To instruct the Secretary General to call for the immediate convocation of a meeting of the Permanent Council in the event of any occurrences giving rise to the sudden or irregular interruption of the democratic political institutional process or of the legitimate exercise of power by the democratically elected government in any of the Organization's member states, in order, within the framework of the Charter, to examine the situation, decide on and convene and ad hoc meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, or a special session of the General Assembly, all of which must take place within a ten-day period.
2. To state that the purpose of the ad hoc meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs or the special session of the General Assembly shall be to look into the events collectively and adopt any decisions deemed appropriate, in accordance with the Charter and international law.
3. To instruct the Permanent Council to devise a set of proposals that will serve as incentives to preserve and strengthen democratic systems, based on international solidarity and cooperation, and to apprise the General Assembly thereof at its twenty-second regular session.

## Declaration of Managua, 1993

The inter-American system decided to confirm and strengthen its commitment to democratic forms of government on the wave of democratization of political systems in Latin America. The process was initiated two years earlier in Santiago de Chile where the Declaration of Santiago and Resolution 1080 were adopted. This is a very strong expression of interdependence of the democratic values and democratic political system with the economic and social development of States in the Western Hemisphere. The signatories point out that democracy, peace, and development are inseparable and indivisible parts of a renewed and integral vision of solidarity in the Americas. The document emphasizes not only the OAS's role in preventing undemocratic changes in the member states but also the necessity to maintain efforts to strengthen young democracies and help in the process of their consolidation.



## Declaration of Managua for the Promotion of Democracy and Development, June 8, 1993

Source: [www.iidh.ed.cr/BibliotecaWeb/](http://www.iidh.ed.cr/BibliotecaWeb/) (17.10.2013)

The Ministers of Foreign Affairs and heads of delegation of the member states of the Organization of American States (OAS), meeting on the occasion of the twenty-third regular session of the OAS General Assembly in Managua, Republic of Nicaragua,

STRESSING that the Organization of American States created at the beginning of this decade valuable mechanisms for the defense of democratic values in the Hemisphere, with due respect for the principle of nonintervention, inspired by the precept that the solidarity of the American states and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those states on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy;

RECALLING the important contributions made in this regard by the Santiago Commitment to Democracy and the Renewal of the Inter-American System, by resolution AG/RES. 1080 ( XXI-O/91 ) "Representative Democracy," by the Declaration of Nassau, and by the "Protocol of Washington" on amendments to the Charter of the Organization;

(...)

### **DECLARE:**

1. The need to consolidate, in the context of the cultural identity of each nation in the Hemisphere, democratic structures and systems which encourage freedom and social justice, safeguard human rights, and favor progress.
2. Their firm belief that democracy, peace, and development are inseparable and indivisible parts of a renewed and integral vision of solidarity in the Americas; and that the ability of the Organization to help preserve and strengthen democratic structures in the region will depend on the implementation of a strategy based on the interdependence and complementarity of those three values.
3. Their conviction that the Organization's mission does not exhaust itself in the defense of democracy wherever its fundamental values and principles have collapsed, but also calls for ongoing and creative work to consolidate democracy as well as a continuing effort to prevent and anticipate the very causes of the problems that work against democratic rule.
4. Their certainty that consolidating democracy requires initiatives and programs aimed both at prevention and incentives for its development, and entails extraordinary efforts to achieve, among other aims, the eradication of the extreme poverty which undermines the full development of democracy among the peoples of the Hemisphere. It therefore calls for the implementation of programs to meet such basic needs as food, health, education, housing, and productive employment, thereby laying the foundations for inter-American cooperation based on the common and solidary goal of integral development.
5. Their opinion that the support and cooperation provided by the OAS toward strengthening democratic institutions through programs to help the states that request them to enhance their own ability to improve their schemes of political organization are fundamental to this new hemispheric commitment. In this regard, they underscore the contribution of the Unit for the Promotion of Democracy and of the Permanent Council in preparing proposed incentives for the preservation and strengthening of democratic systems in the Hemisphere.

6. Their conviction that this hemisphere-wide commitment should address the problem of safeguarding human rights with renewed emphasis on the promotion of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights. The identification of human rights violations should be accompanied by educational and promotional activities to prevent situations in which human rights are threatened.

7. Their support for the processes of modernizing administrative and political structures in those states that request it, in order that governmental action may meet the increasing demands of their people for more effectiveness and more ethical governance.

8. Their certainty that the strengthening of democratic systems requires, in particular cases, efforts to achieve national reconciliation and thereby foster a democratic culture based on the balance and independence of the branches of government, on dialogue and the search for consensus, on respect for the role and responsibility of minorities and of all political groups, and on citizens' participation and peaceful political interaction.

9. Their conviction that all sectors of society in the countries of the Hemisphere must cooperate in a constructive way in strengthening democracy, including governments and political oppositions, and their firm belief that each state should undertake a continuing review of its public administration with a view to improving governance and the relationship between representatives and those represented, in an effort to strengthen democracy, with the cooperation of the OAS, and with due respect for the principle of nonintervention.

10. Their firm belief that this hemispheric commitment requires that its peoples be given greater opportunity to develop, and that that entails closer cooperation founded on a commonality of Inter-American interests, genuine interdependence, reciprocal benefits, and the spirit of shared responsibility which requires that the member states take account of the impact of their actions on development and democratic processes in other member states.

11. Their commitment to continuing and expanding dialogue on hemispheric security among the member states, in an integral and updated approach that takes account of the new international situation with a view to strengthening the peaceful tradition of the Hemisphere and actively contributing to international security and world peace.

12. Their conviction that it is necessary to initiate a broad discussion of the main aspects of integral development, including bilateral and multilateral financial cooperation, investment and debt, expansion and opening up of intra-regional trade, scientific and technological cooperation, and the environment. Inspired by renewed political will, such a discussion should pave the way for a realistic strategy taking advantage of the consensus reached concerning integral development.

13. Their reaffirmation that protection of the environment is fundamental to sustainable development because of its repercussions and effects on the quality of life of people today and its potential for improving the lives of future generations.

14. Their certainty that education plays a vital role in the formation of a new democratic culture of peace and non-violence and that the member states of the Organization will assign high priority to training human resources.

15. Their certainty that trade agreements and especially free trade agreements play an important role in facilitating the growth and consolidation of democracy and, in this regard, their support for the trend towards trade liberalization and expansion.

16. Their commitment to continue working against the illicit production, traffic, and consumption of drugs and related crimes, among them the smuggling of arms, ammunition, and explosives. For this to be successful there will have to be more cooperation among all the countries of the region and in particular of the wider international community in general, to the benefit of peace within each country.

17. Their appreciation of the valuable work done by the OAS in assisting national reconciliation and the consolidation of democratic institutions in some countries of the region. In this context, they note the dynamic role played by the Organization in the country hosting this assembly, where a broad support program, including the ongoing presence of the International Commission for Support and Verification, merits their support.

18. Their recognition of the importance of technology transfers for development and hence their support for the concept of a Common Market of Knowledge initiative which will allow member states of the OAS to share experiences and advances in science and technology, given the urgent need to intensify efforts to speed up the scientific and technological development of Latin America and the Caribbean, in order to boost output, broaden opportunities, for progress, facilitate sustainable development, and enhance the competitiveness of the economies of the region.

19. Their conviction that an important objective for the strengthening of representative democracy in the Hemisphere is that the armed forces be subordinate to the legitimately constituted civilian authority and that they act within the bounds of the constitution and respect for human rights.

20. This declaration will be called "Declaration of Managua for the Promotion of Democracy and Development."

## The North American Free Trade Agreement / Tratado de Libre Comercio en America del Norte, 1994

In consequence of deep economic crisis in Mexico and the radical transformation of Mexican economy from being highly protected into being far more open and liberal and the global tendency toward creating regional economic blocks, the countries of North America decided to start negotiations about the liberalization of trade between the United States, Canada and Mexico. It was Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari who initiated the idea of economic integration between the United States and Mexico. The idea was eagerly picked up by the administration of George W. H. Bush. However, it was the next US president – Bill Clinton who implemented the idea and had to struggle with strong opposition for the ratification of the treaty. He had already declared his support for the idea of the treaty during his presidential campaign. After his electoral victory, Bill Clinton had to carry out a broad campaign in favor of the liberalization of trade with Mexico. Finally, in November 1993 the American Congress passed the North American Free Trade Agreement. It entered into force on January 1, 1994.

The agreement was based on the already existing economic cooperation of the United States with Canada. However, this was a new kind of regional agreement. Sometimes, this kind of agreement is called a third generation agreement as it has some new characteristics that were absent in the earlier agreements on economic cooperation. First, the North American Free Trade Agreement established economic cooperation between two developed countries – the United States and Canada – and one that represented

developing countries. Until the North American Free Trade Agreement, all earlier regional agreements included countries on a similar level of economic development. There were various integration initiatives that included only developed countries or only developing ones. This time, the NAFTA included partners that have completely different economic potentials. Moreover, the NAFTA was not limited to the economic integration. It regulates cooperation in two others important spheres: working conditions and the natural environment. It includes statements related to the protection of intellectual rights, as well. In the area of trade liberalization, it provided a progressive reduction of customs on goods and services. The last stage of customs reduction took place in 2008. The agreement also included a broad range of investment facilities for the signatories.

As the institutional structure of the NAFTA is quite complicated, it has three main institutions that are the reflection of three main areas of cooperation among the parties. They include the Free Trade Commission with its Secretariat, Commission on Labor Cooperation and Commission on Environmental Cooperation. The most complex is the free trade pillar.

The North American Free Trade Agreement was the very first of this kind of treaty signed by the United States with other countries of the Western Hemisphere or groups of states. In 2005, the US Congress ratified the Central American Free Trade Agreement. During the next years it was ratified by the parliaments of El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Honduras. The Dominican Republic also joined this agreement. Moreover, the United States signed the free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, Costa Rica, Chile and Peru.

## The North American Free Trade Agreement, 1994

Source: <https://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/Default.aspx?tabid=97&language=en-US>  
(17.10.2013)

The Government of Canada, the Government of the United Mexican States and the Government of the United States of America

(...)

HAVE AGREED as follows:

### **Article 101: Establishment of the Free Trade Area**

The Parties to this Agreement, consistent with Article XXIV of the *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade*, hereby establish a free trade area.

### **Article 102: Objectives**

1. The objectives of this Agreement, as elaborated more specifically through its principles and rules, including national treatment, most-favored-nation treatment and transparency, are to:

a) eliminate barriers to trade in, and facilitate the cross-border movement of, goods and services between the territories of the Parties;

- b) promote conditions of fair competition in the free trade area;
- c) increase substantially investment opportunities in the territories of the Parties;
- d) provide adequate and effective protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights in each Party's territory;
- e) create effective procedures for the implementation and application of this Agreement, for its joint administration and for the resolution of disputes; and
- f) establish a framework for further trilateral, regional and multilateral cooperation to expand and enhance the benefits of this Agreement.

2. The Parties shall interpret and apply the provisions of this Agreement in the light of its objectives set out in paragraph 1 and in accordance with applicable rules of international law.

#### **Article 103: Relation to Other Agreements**

1. The Parties affirm their existing rights and obligations with respect to each other under the *General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade* and other agreements to which such Parties are party.
2. In the event of any inconsistency between this Agreement and such other agreements, this Agreement shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency, except as otherwise provided in this Agreement.

#### **Article 104: Relation to Environmental and Conservation Agreements**

1. In the event of any inconsistency between this Agreement and the specific trade obligations set out in:

- a) the *Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora*, done at Washington, March 3, 1973, as amended June 22, 1979,
- b) the *Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer*, done at Montreal, September 16, 1987, as amended June 29, 1990,
- c) the *Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal*, done at Basel, March 22, 1989, on its entry into force for Canada, Mexico and the United States, or
- d) the agreements set out in Annex 104.1,

such obligations shall prevail to the extent of the inconsistency, provided that where a Party has a choice among equally effective and reasonably available means of complying with such obligations, the Party chooses the alternative that is the least inconsistent with the other provisions of this Agreement.

2. The Parties may agree in writing to modify Annex 104.1 to include any amendment to an agreement referred to in paragraph 1, and any other environmental or conservation agreement.

#### **Article 105: Extent of Obligations**

The Parties shall ensure that all necessary measures are taken in order to give effect to the provisions of this Agreement, including their observance, except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, by state and provincial governments.

The North American Agreement on Labor Cooperation Between the Government of Canada, the Government of the United Mexican States and the Government of the United States of America

Source: <http://www.dol.gov/ilab/regs/naalc/naalc.htm> (17.10.2013)

**PART ONE**

**OBJECTIVES**

**Article 1: Objectives**

The objectives of this Agreement are to:

- a. improve working conditions and living standards in each Party's territory;
- b. promote, to the maximum extent possible, the labor principles set out in Annex 1;
- c. encourage cooperation to promote innovation and rising levels of productivity and quality;
- d. encourage publication and exchange of information, data development and coordination, and joint studies to enhance mutually beneficial understanding of the laws and institutions governing labor in each Party's territory;
- e. pursue cooperative labor-related activities on the basis of mutual benefit;
- f. promote compliance with, and effective enforcement by each Party of, its labor law; and
- g. foster transparency in the administration of labor law.

**PART TWO**

**OBLIGATIONS**

**Article 2: Levels of Protection**

Affirming full respect for each Party's constitution, and recognizing the right of each Party to establish its own domestic labor standards, and to adopt or modify accordingly its labor laws and regulations, each Party shall ensure that its labor laws and regulations provide for high labor standards, consistent with high quality and productivity workplaces, and shall continue to strive to improve those standards in that light.

**Article 3: Government Enforcement Action**

1. Each Party shall promote compliance with and effectively enforce its labor law through appropriate government action, subject to Article 42, such as:

- a. appointing and training inspectors;
- b. monitoring compliance and investigating suspected violations, including through on-site inspections;
- c. seeking assurances of voluntary compliance;
- d. requiring record keeping and reporting;

- e. encouraging the establishment of worker-management committees to address labor regulation of the workplace;
- f. providing or encouraging mediation, conciliation and arbitration services; or
- g. initiating, in a timely manner, proceedings to seek appropriate sanctions or remedies for violations of its labor law.

2. Each Party shall ensure that its competent authorities give due consideration in accordance with its law to any request by an employer, employee or their representatives, or other interested person, for an investigation of an alleged violation of the Party's labor law.

## The North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation Between the Government of Canada, the Government of the United Mexican States and the Government of the United States of America

Source: <http://www.cec.org/Page.asp?PageID=1226&SiteNodeID=567> (17.10.2013)

### **Article 1: Objectives**

The objectives of this Agreement are to:

- (a) foster the protection and improvement of the environment in the territories of the Parties for the well-being of present and future generations;
- (b) promote sustainable development based on cooperation and mutually supportive environmental and economic policies;
- (c) increase cooperation between the Parties to better conserve, protect, and enhance the environment, including wild flora and fauna;
- (d) support the environmental goals and objectives of the NAFTA;
- (e) avoid creating trade distortions or new trade barriers;
- (f) strengthen cooperation on the development and improvement of environmental laws, regulations, procedures, policies and practices;
- (g) enhance compliance with, and enforcement of, environmental laws and regulations;
- (h) promote transparency and public participation in the development of environmental laws, regulations and policies;
- (i) promote economically efficient and effective environmental measures; and
- (j) promote pollution prevention policies and practices.

### **Article 2: General Commitments**

1. Each Party shall, with respect to its territory:

- (a) periodically prepare and make publicly available reports on the state of the environment;
- (b) develop and review environmental emergency preparedness measures;
- (c) promote education in environmental matters, including environmental law;

(d) further scientific research and technology development in respect of environmental matters;

(e) assess, as appropriate, environmental impacts; and

(f) promote the use of economic instruments for the efficient achievement of environmental goals.

2. Each Party shall consider implementing in its law any recommendation developed by the Council under Article 10(5)(b).

3. Each Party shall consider prohibiting the export to the territories of the other Parties of a pesticide or toxic substance whose use is prohibited within the Party's territory. When a Party adopts a measure prohibiting or severely restricting the use of a pesticide or toxic substance in its territory, it shall notify the other Parties of the measure, either directly or through an appropriate international organization.



## Chapter Nine

# The Summits of the Americas

The end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century brought a significant increase of economic integration initiatives in the world. The development of already existing economic blocks and the process of formation of new regional agreements could be observed. After the collapse of the Soviet bloc in Europe, the majority of the post-communist countries in Central and Eastern Europe announced their willing to join European Community. Simultaneously, the new governments of those countries realized that the formation of new economic connections between them and their strengthening is crucial for their economic development. The example of that kind of regional integration was the creation of the Central European Free Trade Agreement or the Wysehrad Group. The intensification of economic integration was not, however, characteristic only for Europe. Growing interest in regional cooperation and integration could also be observed in Asia and in the Americas. Pacific countries and those from the region of South East Asia created Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation that also included: the United States, Japan and Russia and some Latin American countries (Mexico, Chile, Peru). The last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century also brought growing interest in economic integration in the United States. The North American Free Trade Agreement which established liberalization of trade between the United States, Canada and Mexico entered into force in 1994. This was not enough for the administration of George H. W. Bush. At the beginning of the 1990s, he mentioned the possibility of creating a Free Trade Area of the Americas that would include the United States, Canada and the Latin American and Caribbean countries. This was partially America's response to the development of regional blocks in other parts of the globe but it also was the US's reaction to the growing economic significance of the Latin American countries in a globalized world. At the beginning of the 1990s, a great majority of Latin American countries transformed their economies according to the recommendations of the Washington Consensus and adopted neoliberal reforms.

However, it was George H. W. Bush who first mentioned the idea of the Free Trade Area of the Americas, it was Bill Clinton who started to implement this plan in practice. A few weeks after the beginning of his presidential term Clinton mentioned the idea of creating a free trade area from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego. This was a direct reference to the Enterprise for the Americas and the postulates of George H. W. Bush. Clinton's return to this idea was the consequence of his growing conviction about the importance of Latin American and Caribbean region for the US economy. Also the fact that in the mid-1990s, almost all the Latin American countries already introduced free market economies oriented on export

and interested in participation in international markets, was an important encouragement for US authorities. However, Clinton's proposal was not received enthusiastically by all the Latin American partners. The governments of the largest Latin American economies gave the coldest reception. Argentina demanded the cancellation of high subsidies for US farmers. Meanwhile, president-elect of Brazil, Fernando Henrique Cardoso stated that economic cooperation with the Mercosur members (Argentina, Uruguay, and Paraguay) was a priority for his country. Mexico also failed to show its enthusiasm as it did not want to share the benefits of free trade with the United States and Canada.

## The First Summit of the Americas, Miami, December 9–11, 1994

After consultations that were not easy, the heads of states and governments of the Western Hemisphere met in Miami on December 9–11, 1994. Fidel Castro was the only one absent as he was not invited to the summit. The summit's most important result was the adoption of *The Declaration of Principles* of this Summit. This document established a pact for development and prosperity based on the preservation and strengthening of the community of democracies of the Americas. The leaders defined its objectives as working on the expansion of prosperity through economic integration, the eradication of poverty and discrimination in the Hemisphere and the assurance of sustainable development while protecting the environment. The Declaration includes four parts: *To Preserve and Strengthen the Community of Democracies of the Americas*; *To Promote Prosperity through Economic Integration and Free Trade*; *To Eradicate Poverty and Discrimination in Our Hemisphere*; *To Guarantee Sustainable Development and Conserve Our Natural Environment for Future Generations*. Discussion on the proposition presented by Bill Clinton dominated the summit.

Comments after the summit were various. President Bill Clinton promised to use the so called "fast track" for the rapid ratification of the treaty by the US Congress. The doubts among Latin American leaders remained quite firm, as well. Uruguay, as Brazil, perceived integration in the frames of Mercosur as a priority. Chile also had some reservations. There were, however, also positive comments. The governments of Venezuela and Colombia were among the strong supporters of the idea. Some of the analysts were enthusiastic about the possibility of creating the largest free trade area in the world. After the conclusion of the summit, the signatories of the Declaration did not start immediate and fervent preparations for further works on the free trade area. The preparation for starting the negotiations was delegated to the ministers of commerce of American States. Their first meeting dedicated to the idea of Free Trade Area of the Americas took place in June 1995.

## Declaration of Principles, Miami, December 11, 1994

Source: [http://www.summit-americas.org/i\\_summit.html](http://www.summit-americas.org/i_summit.html) (18.10.2013)

### Partnership for Development and Prosperity: Democracy, Free Trade and Sustainable Development in the Americas

The elected Heads of State and Government of the Americas are committed to advance the prosperity, democratic values and institutions, and security of our Hemisphere. For the first time in history, the Americas are a community of democratic societies. Although faced with differing development challenges, the Americas are united in pursuing prosperity through open markets, hemispheric integration, and sustainable development. We are determined to consolidate and advance closer bonds of cooperation and to transform our aspirations in to concrete realities.

We reiterate our firm adherence to the principles of international law and the purposes and principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter and in the Charter of the Organization of American States (OAS), including the principles of the sovereign equality of states, non-intervention, self-determination, and the peaceful resolution of disputes. We recognize the heterogeneity and diversity of our resources and cultures, just as we are convinced that we can advance our shared interests and values by building strong partnerships.

### To Preserve and Strengthen the Community of Democracies of the Americas

The Charter of the OAS establishes that representative democracy is indispensable for the stability, peace and development of the region. It is the sole political system which guarantees respect for human rights and the rule of law; it safeguards cultural diversity, pluralism, respect for the rights of minorities, and peace within and among nations. Democracy is based, among other fundamentals, on free and transparent elections and includes the right of all citizens to participate in government. Democracy and development reinforce one another.

We reaffirm our commitment to preserve and strengthen our democratic systems for the benefit of all people of the Hemisphere. We will work through the appropriate bodies of the OAS to strengthen democratic institutions and promote and defend constitutional democratic rule, in accordance with the OAS Charter. We endorse OAS efforts to enhance peace and the democratic, social, and economic stability of the region.

We recognize that our people earnestly seek greater responsiveness and efficiency from our respective governments. Democracy is strengthened by the modernization of the state, including reforms that streamline operations, reduce and simplify government rules and procedures, and make democratic institutions more transparent and accountable. Deeming it essential that justice should be accessible in an efficient and expeditious way to all sectors of society, we affirm that an independent judiciary is a critical element of an effective legal system and lasting democracy. Our ultimate goal is to better meet the needs of the population, especially the needs of women and the most vulnerable groups, including indigenous people, the disabled, children, the aged, and minorities.

Effective democracy requires a comprehensive attack on corruption as a factor of social disintegration and distortion of the economic system that undermines the legitimacy of political institutions.

Recognizing the pernicious effects of organized crime and illegal narcotics on our economies, ethical values, public health, and the social fabric, we will join the battle against the consumption, production, trafficking and distribution of illegal drugs, as well as

against money laundering and the illicit trafficking in arms and chemical precursors. We will also cooperate to create viable alternative development strategies in those countries in which illicit crops are grown. Cooperation should be extended to international and national programs aimed at curbing the production, use and trafficking of illicit drugs and the rehabilitation of addicts.

We condemn terrorism in all its forms, and we will, using all legal means, combat terrorist acts anywhere in the Americas with unity and vigor.

Recognizing the important contribution of individuals and associations in effective democratic government and in the enhancement of cooperation among the people of the Hemisphere, we will facilitate fuller participation of our people in political, economic and social activity, in accordance with national legislation.

#### To Promote Prosperity through Economic Integration and Free Trade

Our continued economic progress depends on sound economic policies, sustainable development, and dynamic private sectors. A key to prosperity is trade without barriers, without subsidies, without unfair practices, and with an increasing stream of productive investments. Eliminating impediments to market access for goods and services among our countries will foster our economic growth. A growing world economy will also enhance our domestic prosperity. Free trade and increased economic integration are key factors for raising standards of living, improving the working conditions of people in the Americas and better protecting the environment.

We, therefore, resolve to begin immediately to construct the "Free Trade Area of the Americas" (FTAA), in which barriers to trade and investment will be progressively eliminated. We further resolve to conclude the negotiation of the "Free Trade Area of the Americas" no later than 2005, and agree that concrete progress toward the attainment of this objective will be made by the end of this century. We recognize the progress that already has been realized through the unilateral undertakings of each of our nations and the subregional trade arrangements in our Hemisphere. We will build on existing subregional and bilateral arrangements in order to broaden and deepen hemispheric economic integration and to bring the agreements together.

Aware that investment is the main engine for growth in the Hemisphere, we will encourage such investment by cooperating to build more open, transparent and integrated markets. In this regard, we are committed to create strengthened mechanisms that promote and protect the flow of productive investment in the Hemisphere, and to promote the development and progressive integration of capital markets.

To advance economic integration and free trade, we will work, with cooperation and financing from the private sector and international financial institutions, to create a hemispheric infrastructure. This process requires a cooperative effort in fields such as telecommunications, energy and transportation, which will permit the efficient movement of the goods, services, capital, information and technology that are the foundations of prosperity.

We recognize that despite the substantial progress in dealing with debt problems in the Hemisphere, high foreign debt burdens still hinder the development of some of our countries. We recognize that economic integration and the creation of a free trade area will be complex endeavors, particularly in view of the wide differences in the levels of development and size of economies existing in our Hemisphere. We will remain cognizant of these differences as we work toward economic integration in the Hemisphere. We look to our own resources, ingenuity, and individual capacities as well as to the international community to help us achieve our goals.

#### To Eradicate Poverty and Discrimination in Our Hemisphere

It is politically intolerable and morally unacceptable that some segments of our populations are marginalized and do not share fully in the benefits of growth. With an aim of

attaining greater social justice for all our people, we pledge to work individually and collectively to improve access to quality education and primary health care and to eradicate extreme poverty and illiteracy. The fruits of democratic stability and economic growth must be accessible to all, without discrimination by race, gender, national origin or religious affiliation.

(...)

To Guarantee Sustainable Development and Conserve Our Natural Environment for Future Generations

Social progress and economic prosperity can be sustained only if our people live in a healthy environment and our ecosystems and natural resources are managed carefully and responsibly. To advance and implement the commitments made at the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro, and the 1994 Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, held in Barbados, we will create cooperative partnerships to strengthen our capacity to prevent and control pollution, to protect ecosystems and use our biological resources on a sustainable basis, and to encourage clean, efficient and sustainable energy production and use. To benefit future generations through environmental conservation, including the rational use of our ecosystems, natural resources and biological heritage, we will continue to pursue technological, financial and other forms of cooperation.

(...)

Our thirty-four nations share a fervent commitment to democratic practices, economic integration, and social justice. Our people are better able than ever to express their aspirations and to learn from one another. The conditions for hemispheric cooperation are propitious. Therefore, on behalf of all our people, in whose name we affix our signatures to this Declaration, we seize this historic opportunity to create a Partnership for Development and Prosperity in the Americas.

## The Second Summit of the Americas, Santiago de Chile, April 18–19, 1998

During the meeting in Belo Horizonte, May 1997, the ministers of commerce of 34 countries of the Americas announced the willingness to start negotiations over the free trade area. According to their recommendations, negotiations would have to be initiated during the Second Summit of the Americas. The Belo Horizonte meeting was the first step to the official initiation of the negotiations. During the next ministerial meeting (San Jose, March 1998) ministers of trade obligated the heads of states and governments of 34 countries of Western Hemisphere to start negotiations over the free trade area. At this meeting, the trade ministers prepared a detailed plan of what, when and where should be negotiated. Also, the Trade Negotiations Committee (TNC) was established. The deadline was established for 2005 as the year in which the free trade area would start its functioning.

The second Summit of the Americas was held on April 18–19, 1998 in the capital of Chile. The leaders of the same 34 countries that participated in the Miami summit met once again. The main objective of the summit was the official launching of the negotiations about the Free Trade Area of the Americas/Area del Libre Comercio de las Americas (FTAA/ALCA). The second day of the summit brought the adoption of the new Declaration. In this document, the signatories underlined that in the last years the countries of the Western Hemisphere took strong efforts to achieve common goals in the fight against inflation and poverty. The signatories of the Declaration expressed their deep believe that the creation of the FTAA would be a crucial step toward economic development of the countries of the Western Hemisphere and would help improve the economic and social situation of its citizens. The new element that appeared in the Declaration was education. It is said that education is a key factor in the struggle for the improvement of living conditions. In effect, a general agreement on the necessity to maintain efforts to improve the access of the citizens to primary and secondary schools and to higher education was announced. Statements on human rights, discrimination, world peace, judicial administration also appeared in the Declaration. For the first time, the leaders brought up the subject of drug trafficking.

The main achievement of the Santiago Summit was the official launching of negotiations over the FTAA. However, discussions during the summit were not deprived of difficulties and disappointments. The most disappointing for Latin American leaders was Bill Clinton's failure in approaching the 'fast track' procedure. This would permit the US president to negotiate an agreement that Congress could either approve or reject, without the possibility of amending it. Leaders confirmed the date of 2005 as the final date for establishing the FTAA.

### Santiago Declaration, April 18–19, 1998

Source: [http://www.summit-americas.org/ii\\_summit.html](http://www.summit-americas.org/ii_summit.html) (18.10.2013)

We, the democratically-elected Heads of State and Government of the countries of the Americas, have met in Santiago, Chile, in order to continue the dialogue and strengthen the cooperation we began in Miami in December 1994. Since that time, significant progress has been made in the formulation and execution of joint plans and programs in order to take advantage of the great opportunities before us. We reaffirm our will to continue this most important undertaking, which requires sustained national efforts and dynamic international cooperation.

The strengthening of democracy, political dialogue, economic stability, progress towards social justice, the extent to which our trade liberalization policies coincide, and the will to expedite a process of ongoing Hemispheric integration have made our relations more mature. We will redouble our efforts to continue reforms designed to improve the living conditions of the peoples of the Americas and to achieve a mutually supportive community. For this reason, we have decided that education is a key theme and is of particular importance in our deliberations. We approve the attached Plan of Action and undertake to carry out its initiatives.

Since our meeting in Miami, we have seen real economic benefits in the Americas resulting from more open trade, transparency in economic regulations, sound, market-based economic policies, as well as efforts by the private sector to increase its competitiveness. Even as countries in our region have been tested by financial and other economic pressures, and as countries in other regions have experienced serious economic setbacks, the overall course in the Americas has been one of faster economic growth, lower inflation, expanded opportunities, and confidence in facing the global marketplace. A major reason for this positive record has been our countries steadfast and cooperative efforts to promote prosperity through increased economic integration and more open economies. New partnerships have been formed and existing ones strengthened and expanded. A positive role is being played by sub-regional and bilateral integration and free trade agreements. We are confident that the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) will improve the well-being of all our people, including economically disadvantaged populations within our respective countries.

Hemispheric integration is a necessary complement to national policies aimed at overcoming lingering problems and obtaining a higher level of development. In its broadest sense, a process of integration based on respect for cultural identities will make it possible to shape a common, interwoven set of values and interests that helps us in these objectives.

Globalization offers great opportunities for progress to our countries and opens up new areas of cooperation for the hemispheric community. However, it can also heighten the differences among countries and within our societies. With steadfast determination to reap its benefits and to face its challenges, we will give special attention to the most vulnerable countries and social groups in the Hemisphere.

Education is the determining factor for the political, social, cultural, and economic development of our peoples. We undertake to facilitate access of all inhabitants of the Americas to preschool, primary, secondary, and higher education, and we will make learning a life-long process. We will put science and technology at the service of education to assure growing levels of knowledge and so that educators may develop their skills to the highest level. The Plan of Action that accompanies this Declaration defines the objectives and goals we intend to achieve and the actions that will make them a reality. In order to meet our goals within the agreed timeframes, we reaffirm our commitment to invest greater resources in this important area, and to encourage civil society to participate in developing education.

(...)

Today, we direct our Ministers Responsible for Trade to begin negotiations for the FTAA, in accordance with the March 1998 Ministerial Declaration of San José. We reaffirm our determination to conclude the negotiation of the FTAA no later than 2005, and to make concrete progress by the end of the century. The FTAA agreement will be balanced, comprehensive, WTO-consistent and constitute a single undertaking.

(...)

The FTAA negotiating process will be transparent, and take into account the differences in the levels of development and size of the economies in the Americas, in order to create the opportunities for the full participation by all countries. We encourage all segments of civil society to participate in and contribute to the process in a constructive manner, through our respective mechanisms of dialogue and consultation and by presenting their views through the mechanism created in the FTAA negotiating process. We believe that economic integration, investment, and free trade are key factors for raising standards of living, improving the working conditions of the people of the Americas and better protecting the environment. These issues will be taken into account as we proceed with the economic integration process in the Americas.

(...)

The strength and meaning of representative democracy lie in the active participation of individuals at all levels of civic life. The democratic culture must encompass our entire population. We will strengthen education for democracy and promote the necessary actions for government institutions to become more participatory structures. We undertake to strengthen the capabilities of regional and local governments, when appropriate, and to foster more active participation in civil society.

Respect for and promotion of human rights and the fundamental freedoms of all individuals is a primary concern of our governments. In commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we agree on the need to promote the ratification and implementation of the international agreements aimed at preserving them and to continue strengthening the pertinent national and international institutions. We agree that a free press plays a fundamental role in this area and we reaffirm the importance of guaranteeing freedom of expression, information, and opinion. We commend the recent appointment of a Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression, within the framework of the Organization of American States.

Confident that an independent, efficient, and effective administration of justice plays an essential role in the process of consolidating democracy, strengthens its institutions, guarantees the equality of all its citizens, and contributes to economic development, we will enhance our policies relating to justice and encourage the reforms necessary to promote legal and judicial cooperation. To that end, we will strengthen national entities involved in the study of the administration of justice and expedite the establishment of a hemispheric center for studies on this subject.

We will combat all forms of discrimination in the Hemisphere. Equal rights and opportunities between men and women and the objective of ensuring active participation of women in all areas of national endeavor are priority tasks. We will continue to promote the full integration of indigenous populations and other vulnerable groups into political and economic life, with due respect for the characteristics and expressions that affirm their cultural identity. We will make a special effort to guarantee the human rights of all migrants, including migrant workers and their families.

Overcoming poverty continues to be the greatest challenge confronted by our Hemisphere. We are conscious that the positive growth shown in the Americas in past years has yet to resolve the problems of inequity and social exclusion. We are determined to remove the barriers that deny the poor access to proper nutrition, social services, a healthy environment, credit, and legal title to their property. We will provide greater support to micro and small enterprises, promote core labor standards recognized by the International Labor Organization (ILO), and use new technologies to improve the health conditions of every family in the Americas, with the technical support of the Pan-American Health Organization (PAHO), achieving greater levels of equity and sustainable development.

(...)

In forging an alliance against drugs and applying the Hemispheric Anti-Drug Strategy, we welcome the start of formal negotiations at the May 4 meeting of Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD) to be held in Washington within the framework of the Organization of American States (OAS), to establish an objective procedure for the multilateral evaluation of actions and cooperation to prevent and combat all aspects of the drug problem and related crimes, based on the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity of States, shared responsibility, and with a comprehensive and balanced approach.

We will strengthen national, hemispheric, and international efforts aimed at environmental protection as a basis for sustainable development that provides human beings a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature. The commitments undertaken at



the Miami Summit and the Summit on Sustainable Development held in Santa Cruz de la Sierra, Bolivia, provide a solid basis for strengthening our actions. As parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, we underscore the importance of working together to further fulfillment of the agreement reached at the Conference in Kyoto, Japan, and to promote its ratification in our countries. Moreover, we will work closely to make preparations for a Conference of the Parties to be held in November of this year in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

We acknowledge that the development of energy links between our countries and the intensification of trade in the energy sector strengthen and foster the integration of the Americas. Energy integration, based on competitive and transparent activities, and in compliance with national conditions and objectives, contributes to the sustainable development of our nations and to the improvement of the quality of life of our people with minimum impact on the environment.

(...)

Done in Santiago, Chile, on this the 19<sup>th</sup> day of April, 1998, in the Spanish, French, English and Portuguese languages.

## The Third Summit of the Americas, Quebec City, April 20–22, 2001

During the ministerial meeting in Buenos Aires on April 7, 2001 representatives of 34 countries of the Western Hemisphere obligated the heads of states and governments participating in the process of creating the FTAA to organize the third Summit of the Americas. The aim of that summit would be to initiate the procedure of finalizing negotiations on the FTAA not later than in 2005.

The third Summit of the Americas was held in Quebec City, Canada, April 20–22, 2001. Before the summit, there was a significant debate related to the FTAA creation. There were those who supported the idea, principally the new administration of George W. Bush and less enthusiastic leaders of some Latin American states. The latter ones pointed out the huge disproportion in economic potentials between the United States and its southern neighbors. There were those who represented a disappointment of liberal and market-oriented reforms in Latin America. Also, the skeptics pointed out the visible cooling in US economy at the turn of the centuries. They urged that this could have important repercussions on the other economies in the Western Hemisphere. Meanwhile, President George W. Bush and his advisors were demonstrating strong support for the liberalization of trade and the idea of the FTAA. They often repeated that the completion of this initiative is one of the priorities of its administration.

According to the tradition of the previous summits, the third one resulted in the adoption of the Declaration. Apart from the traditional statements about the necessity of intensifying efforts to prevent poverty and strengthening economic development, this

time, the leaders of the 34 countries focused more attention on the problem of democracy and dangers to the process of democratization in the countries of the region. The signatories emphasized that the maintenance and strengthening of democratic values are the goal and condition sine qua non of participation in the Summits of Americas. In effect, all the unconstitutional changes of governments would result in automatic exclusion from the Summits. The Quebec City Declaration stressed that dangers to democratic political systems take on different forms and to prevent them, foreign ministers of the participating countries would have to consider instruments to defend democracy. It is worth emphasizing that the statement on democracy was not signed by the Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez.

### Declaration of Quebec City, April 20–22, 2001

Source: [http://www.summit-americas.org/iii\\_summit.html](http://www.summit-americas.org/iii_summit.html) (19.10.2013)

We, the democratically elected Heads of State and Government of the Americas, have met in Quebec City at our Third Summit, to renew our commitment to hemispheric integration and national and collective responsibility for improving the economic well-being and security of our people. We have adopted a Plan of Action to strengthen representative democracy, promote good governance and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms.\* We seek to create greater prosperity and expand economic opportunities while fostering social justice and the realization of human potential.

We reiterate our firm commitment and adherence to the principles and purposes of the Charters of the United Nations and of the Organization of American States (OAS).

(...)

We acknowledge that the values and practices of democracy are fundamental to the advancement of all our objectives. The maintenance and strengthening of the rule of law and strict respect for the democratic system are, at the same time, a goal and a shared commitment and are an essential condition of our presence at this and future Summits. Consequently, any unconstitutional alteration or interruption of the democratic order in a state of the Hemisphere constitutes an insurmountable obstacle to the participation of that state's government in the Summit of the Americas process. Having due regard for existing hemispheric, regional and sub-regional mechanisms, we agree to conduct consultations in the event of a disruption of the democratic system of a country that participates in the Summit process.

Threats to democracy today take many forms. To enhance our ability to respond to these threats, we instruct our Foreign Ministers to prepare, in the framework of the next General Assembly of the OAS, an Inter-American Democratic Charter to reinforce OAS instruments for the active defense of representative democracy.\*

Our commitment to full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is based on shared principles and convictions. We support strengthening and enhancing the effectiveness of the inter American human rights system, which includes the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. We mandate the XXXI General Assembly of the OAS to consider an adequate increase in resources for the activities of the Commission and the Court in order to improve human rights mechanisms and to promote the observance of the recommendations of the

Commission and compliance with the judgments of the Court. We reaffirm our commitment to maintain peace and security through the effective use of hemispheric means for the peaceful resolution of disputes and the adoption of confidence- and security-building measures. In this regard, we support and commend the efforts of the OAS. We reiterate our full adherence to the principle that commits states to refrain from the threat or use of force, in accordance with international law. In conformity with the principles of international humanitarian law, we strongly condemn attacks on civilian populations. We will take all feasible measures to ensure that the children of our countries do not participate in armed conflict and we condemn the use of children by irregular forces. We reaffirm that the constitutional subordination of armed forces and security forces to the legally constituted civilian authorities of our countries, as well as respect for the rule of law on the part of all national institutions and sectors of society, are fundamental to democracy. We will strive to limit military expenditures while maintaining capabilities commensurate with our legitimate security needs and will promote greater transparency in the acquisition of arms.

We reiterate our commitment to combat new, multi-dimensional threats to the security of our societies. Foremost amongst these threats are the global drug problem and related crimes, the illicit traffic in and criminal use of firearms, the growing danger posed by organized crime and the general problem of violence in our societies. Acknowledging that corruption undermines core democratic values, challenges political stability and economic growth and thus threatens vital interests in our Hemisphere, we pledge to reinvigorate our fight against corruption. We also recognize the need to improve the conditions for human security in the Hemisphere.

We renew our commitment to the full implementation of the Anti-Drug Strategy in the Hemisphere, based on the principles of shared responsibility, a comprehensive and balanced approach, and multilateral cooperation. We welcome the development of the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism and reiterate our commitment to make this mechanism, unique in the world, one of the central pillars in effective hemispheric cooperation in the struggle against all the factors that constitute the global drug problem. We express our support for effective alternative development programs aimed at the eradication of illicit cultivation and will strive to facilitate market access for products resulting from these programs.

We acknowledge that another major threat to the security of our people is HIV/AIDS. We are united in our resolve to adopt multi-sectoral strategies and to develop our cooperation to combat this disease and its consequences.

We reaffirm the importance of an independent judiciary and our determination to ensure equal access to justice and to guarantee its timely and impartial administration. We commit ourselves to increase transparency throughout government.

Free and open economies, market access, sustained flows of investment, capital formation, financial stability, appropriate public policies, access to technology and human resources development and training are key to reducing poverty and inequalities, raising living standards and promoting sustainable development. We will work with all sectors of civil society and international organizations to ensure that economic activities contribute to the sustainable development of our societies.

(...)

We direct our Ministers to ensure that negotiations of the FTAA Agreement are concluded no later than January 2005 and to seek its entry into force as soon as possible thereafter, but in any case, no later than December 2005.\*\* This will be a key element for generating the economic growth and prosperity in the Hemisphere that will contribute to the achievement of the broad Summit objectives. The Agreement should be balanced, comprehensive and consistent with World Trade Organization (WTO) rules and disciplines and should constitute a single undertaking. We attach great importance to the design of an

Agreement that takes into account the differences in the size and levels of development of participating economies.

We acknowledge the challenge of environmental management in the Hemisphere. We commit our governments to strengthen environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources with a view to ensuring a balance among economic development, social development and the protection of the environment, as these are interdependent and mutually reinforcing. Our goal is to achieve sustainable development throughout the Hemisphere.

(...)

Recognizing the importance of energy as one of the fundamental bases for economic development, the region's prosperity and improved quality of life, we commit to pursuing renewable energy initiatives, promoting energy integration and enhancing regulatory frameworks and their application, while promoting the principles of sustainable development.

Democracy and economic and social development are interdependent and mutually reinforcing as fundamental conditions to combat poverty and inequality. We will spare no effort to free our fellow citizens from the dehumanizing conditions of extreme poverty. We commit to further efforts to reach international development goals, especially the reduction by 50% by the year 2015 of the proportion of people living in extreme poverty.

(...)

We recognize the cultural and economic contributions made by migrants to receiving societies as well as to their communities of origin. We are committed to ensuring dignified, humane treatment with appropriate legal protections, defense of human rights, and safe and healthy labor conditions for migrants. We will strengthen mechanisms for hemispheric cooperation to address the legitimate needs of migrants and take effective measures against trafficking in human beings.

Progress towards more democratic societies, growing economies and social equity relies on an educated citizenry and a skilled labor force. We have agreed to a series of policies to improve access to quality education through teacher training, education in civic values and the use of information technologies both in our classrooms and in measuring progress toward achieving these goals. Improved education policies and increased investment in our education systems will help reduce income disparities and close the digital divide in our Hemisphere.

(...)

We emphasize that good health and equal access to medical attention, health services and affordable medicine are critical to human development and the achievement of our political, economic and social objectives.

We reaffirm our commitment to protect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of all, including those who are vulnerable, marginalized, disabled or require special protection. We are committed to the eradication of all forms of discrimination, including racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and other related intolerance in our societies, as well as to the promotion of gender equality, and to achieving the full participation of all persons in the political, economic, social and cultural life of our countries.

We will work to ensure that the input from the Indigenous Conclave of the Americas, held in Guatemala, and the Indigenous Peoples Summit of the Americas, held in Ottawa, is reflected in the implementation of the Summit of the Americas Declaration and Plan of Action. We support efforts towards early and successful conclusion of negotiations on the Proposed American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which will promote and protect their human rights and fundamental freedoms.

We consider the cultural diversity that characterizes our region to be a source of great richness for our societies. Respect for and value of our diversity must be a cohesive factor that strengthens the social fabric and the development of our nations.

(...)

The OAS has a central role in the implementation of the decisions of the Summits of the Americas. We instruct our Foreign Ministers, at the next General Assembly, to advance and deepen the process of reform in the OAS, supported by appropriate resources, to improve its functioning and to enable the Organization to better implement our Summit mandates.

(...)

\*The Venezuelan delegation wishes to reserve its position on paragraphs 1 and 6 of the Declaration of Quebec City, because, according to our government, democracy should be understood in its broadest sense and not only in its representative quality. We understand that the exercise of democracy encompasses, as well, citizen participation in decision-making and in government management, with a view to the daily formation of a process directed towards the integral development of society. Because of this, the Venezuelan government would have preferred and thus requested that, in this Summit, the text of the Declaration would expressly reflect the participatory character of democracy.

\*\*The Venezuelan delegation reserves its position on paragraph 15 of the Declaration of Quebec City and paragraph 6-A of the Plan of Action, in light of consultations that are taking place in various sectors of the national government dedicated to our internal legislation, in order to fulfill the commitments that would result from the implementation of the FTAA in the year 2005.

## The Fourth Summit of the Americas, Mar del Plata, November 5, 2005

After the Quebec City summit the efforts to create the FTAA weakened significantly. There were plenty of reasons that produced an important stagnancy in the FTAA creation process. After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 the George W. Bush's administration changed its priorities. The global war on terrorism, the war in Afghanistan and the military intervention in Iraq dominated US foreign policy. The dominance of economic affairs was replaced by the priority of national security. The US administration was also concentrated on security matters in its relations with Latin America. In Latin America the attitude toward the United States and its foreign policy changed as well. There was growing disappointment from the neoliberal reforms of the 1990s. Since the neoliberal economic transformation in the region, some countries experienced a rapid economic growth but also a deep crisis. Poverty reduction was unsuccessful. As a consequence, the Latin American societies turned their political sympathies to the left. It resulted in so called "left turn" in Latin America and a series of electoral victories

of leftist politicians. Since 1998, the leader of the Latin American left and anti-liberal policy was Hugo Chavez President of Venezuela. He promoted the idea of socialism of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and put it into practice in Venezuela. Chavez used the reach Venezuelan oil reserves as an instrument of its foreign policy. Also, the Latin American left was blaming the United States for unsatisfactory economic aid to Latin American countries. The idea of free trade became identified with US economic exploitation of the region. This is why the FTAA initiative was strongly criticized.

In the situation of intensive tension between the United States and some leftist governments of Latin American countries, the expectations before the fourth Summit of the Americas could not be high. However, the George W. Bush believed that the summit will demonstrate a strong will for cooperation and integration. In fact, the Mar del Plata summit was a great disappointment for all supporters of the FTAA initiative. The Summit became an ideal occasion for all anti-American politicians and organizations to manifest their rejection toward US foreign policy. George W. Bush was personally accused of imperialist policy and a unilateral attitude toward international relations. Hugo Chavez used the Summit as an opportunity to demonstrate his radical anti-Americanism and anti-imperialism. He also decided to use the Summit to gain new supporters among Latin American leaders. As an instrument to reach those goals, he organized a populist manifestation with the presence of thousands of people, other leftist leaders and some famous persons, including Diego Maradona. It is worth pointing out that Chavez was the only who entirely criticized the FTAA project already at the Quebec City Summit. He had much more allies at Mar de Plata in November 2005. Probably more than George W. Bush had during that Summit.

In effect, the ambitious goal of creating the Free Trade Area of the Americas in 2005 failed at the Mar del Plata Summit. The meeting was full of difficult negotiations and disputes. Mainly, it became a stage of strong anti-liberal and anti-American demonstrations, both of Latin American leaders during the official meetings and the Latin American society during the street manifestations.

The Summit concluded with the Declaration. However, the Declaration from Mar de Plata reflected the atmosphere of the Summit. It includes some general statements on further cooperation but there were few that believed that any cooperation was still possible. Even less believed that the idea of the FTAA has any chance of being implemented in the future. However, what is important in the entire process of the Summits of the Americas is the fact that the meetings became an important forum of discussion among the countries in the Western Hemisphere. They are still organized, more or less systematically. Six summits have taken place until the present day. The last one took place in 2012 in Cartagena, Colombia. It is important to perceive the summits as a form of dialogue between the countries. It is very important, especially taking the very peculiar relations between the United States and Latin American and the Caribbean into account.

## Declaration of Mar del Plata, November 5, 2005

### Creating Jobs to Fight Poverty and Strengthen Democratic Governance

Source: [http://www.summit-americas.org/sp\\_summit.html](http://www.summit-americas.org/sp_summit.html) (19.10.2013)

1. Convinced of the necessity to deepen democracy and consolidate freedom in the Americas, in accordance with the principles contained in the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Democratic Charter and their full application as the foundation of the hemispheric community, we, the Heads of State and Government of the democratic countries of the Americas, gathered in the city of Mar del Plata, Argentina, on the occasion of our Fourth Summit, reaffirm our commitment to fight poverty, inequality, hunger, and social exclusion in order to raise the standard of living of our peoples and strengthen democratic governance in the Americas. We assign the right to work, as articulated in human rights instruments, a central place on the hemispheric agenda, recognizing the essential role of the creation of decent work to achieve these objectives.

(...)

#### **Growth with Employment**

4. In search of sustained, long-term, and equitable economic growth that creates jobs, reduces poverty, eliminates hunger, and raises the standard of living, including for the most vulnerable sectors and social groups, and in the framework of national strategies, we are committed to continuing the implementation of sound macroeconomic policies geared toward maintaining high growth rates, full employment, prudent fiscal and monetary policies, appropriate exchange rate policies, sound public debt management policies, and working to diversify economic activity and improve competitiveness. At the same time, we will stimulate income growth and better income distribution, increasing productivity, and protecting workers' rights and the environment. We recognize that the appropriate role of government in market oriented economies will vary from country to country.\*

5. We emphasize the importance of the participation of the business sector in achieving our objectives. We recognize, in particular, that micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises, providers of goods and services, constitute a fundamental component for economic growth, job creation, and reduction of poverty and social inequality in our countries.

6. We reaffirm our commitment to the Monterrey Consensus that each country has primary responsibility for its own economic and social development through sound policies, promotion of good governance at all levels and respect for the rule of law and that, at the same time, the international community should support national development efforts. In this context, we reiterate that trade and investment opportunities are necessary for countries in fighting poverty and in their development efforts. Also, in this context, we commit to coordinate international efforts in support of sustainable development policies, to identify secure sources of financing, and to mobilize resources for development and the fight against poverty and hunger.

7. We are concerned also to note that poverty is a phenomenon found in all the countries of the Hemisphere and that extreme poverty affects millions of people. In that regard, we are committed to intensifying our efforts toward attaining the goals agreed to at the Millennium Summit, especially that of reducing, by 50%, the proportion of persons living in extreme poverty by 2015 given the fact that, despite the efforts made by the countries

of Latin America and the Caribbean, more than 96 million people still live in extreme poverty.

8. We recognize that economic growth is a basic, indispensable, but not sufficient, condition to address the high rates of unemployment, poverty, and growth of the informal economy. We recognize that only countries that have had years of sustained economic growth have successfully reduced poverty. However, in the recent past some countries of the Hemisphere have experienced periods of economic growth that did not translate into equivalent employment gains, compounding existing problems of high income concentration, poverty, and indigence. The challenge is to sustain higher rates of growth with equity and social inclusion, and to generate expanded opportunities, social investment, and social development. Good economic policies and a favorable international commercial and economic framework are factors that have helped the region achieve, in 2004, rising incomes and the fastest growth rates in a quarter century, which boosted job creation.

(...)

15. One of the major challenges to democratic stability is to generate productive and quality employment in the interest of ensuring that all our people benefit from economic prosperity. We support a country's legitimate right to pursue and attain its development within the framework of its political, economic, social, and cultural realities. We reiterate our commitment to achieving greater economic integration and we will adopt economic policies that promote economic growth, generate employment, and reduce poverty. To this end, we will address the problems that come about because of trade barriers and unsustainable debt, and we will continue to reform the international financial architecture.

16. This reform has the following objectives, among others: to contribute to the prevention and rapid resolution of financial crises, which particularly harm developing countries in the region; to enhance financing for development; to combat poverty; and to strengthen democratic governance. We stress the need for multilateral financial institutions, in providing policy advice and financial support, to work on the basis of sound, nationally owned paths of reform that the respective countries have identified with, and which take into account the needs of the poor and measures to reduce poverty. To achieve our sustainable development objectives, we need international and multilateral institutions that are more efficient, democratic, and accountable. We call upon the international and regional financial institutions to strengthen coordination of their activities so that they can respond more effectively to the long-term development needs of the countries of the region to achieve measurable results in their efforts to eradicate poverty through more effective use of all available development financing sources. For the poorest and least creditworthy countries, we support increased multilateral development banks (MDB) funding provided as performance-based grants.

(...)

### **Jobs to Fight Poverty**

20. Considering the widespread demand for dignified, decent, and productive work in the Hemisphere, the great task of our societies and governments in combating poverty and social exclusion is to adopt policies for generating more and better jobs in rural and urban areas, to contribute effectively to social inclusion and cohesion, prosperity, and democratic governance.

(...)

### **Strengthening Democratic Governance**

57. We reiterate our commitment to the OAS Charter and the Inter-American Democratic Charter and we reaffirm our resolve to strengthen their full and effective implementation.



58. We are convinced that representative democracy is an indispensable condition for the stability, peace, and development of the region. We recognize that for democracy to prosper, governments must be responsive to the legitimate aspirations of their people and work to provide their people with the tools and opportunities to improve their lives.

(...)

\* Reservation by the Delegation of Venezuela



## Chapter Ten

# The War on Drugs

The collapse of the socialist bloc and the Soviet Union brought enormous changes in world geopolitics and naturally in US foreign policy as the Cold War competition determined it for almost fifty years. This fact constituted a significant change of priorities for American diplomacy. Firstly, it changed the hierarchy of threats to national security. These deep changes also included US Latin American policy. As the threat of communist expansion in the Latin American and Caribbean region was the principal determinant of American policy in the region, at the beginning of the 1990s the United States had to reformulate the objectives and foundations of its Latin American policy. The total failure of the systems based on the Marxist-Leninist ideology liquidated the danger of communist expansion in the region and in the world. That danger was replaced by the new threats that define US Latin American policy since the beginning of the 1990s. Arms smuggling, drugs manufacturing and trafficking, economic development, social and economic inequalities began to dominate the United States policy in the region. All those challenges were very complicated and demanded comprehensive actions and different instruments. After the passing of more than two decades one can observe that drug trafficking is the most important threat and very complicated problem to resolve for US administrations. For many years, the US authorities underestimated the drug problem. It was not perceived as a serious problem at the national level nor was it perceived as a threat to national security. During the Cold War period it was understandable that the containment of communism in the region was the priority of US policy. Such a policy, however, led to the development of narco-business in Latin American and Caribbean countries. Also, drug addiction became a significant domestic problem in the United States.

The problem of drug addiction was growing in the United States since the end of 1960s and the federal authorities could no longer ignore it. In effect, it was President Richard Nixon who – for the first time – paid greater attention to the problem. He undertook some significant steps in fighting the problem. President Nixon is famous for his idea of the ‘war on drugs.’ For the first time, the highest authority in the United States perceived drugs as a serious danger to US security. As a result of the new attitude, the United States initiated the use of new instruments of foreign policy to resolve the drug problem. The dominance of the supply approach is what was – and to some extent still is – the great characteristic of the US war on drugs. This means that the US authorities prefer to fight narco-business abroad. For this purpose, the US uses a broad spectrum of instruments: diplomacy, economic aid, political pressure, military aid, US federal agencies responsible

for combating drug trafficking and organized crime and many others. Plan Colombia, which is the base of the US antidrug policy in the Andean region, had to be an example of multidimensional activities but it is dominated by military aid for countries of the region, principally Colombia. Another initiative carried out together with the Mexican government – known as Plan Merida – was dedicated to strengthening Mexican capabilities in the war on drugs. Today the most known part of this war on drugs takes place in Mexico. The US government is strongly engaged in fighting drug cartels that produce new kinds of drugs in Mexico and/or smuggle them from the Andean countries, principally from Colombia. The anti-drug policy of the United States has strongly evolved since the beginning of the 1970s. Simultaneously, however, it had and still has a huge impact on US relations with particular Latin American and Caribbean countries.

## Richard Nixon's "War on Drugs"

During the decade of 1960s a significant growth in drug consumption could be observed in the United States. This was a multidimensional problem. One of the principle causes of this trend of growing consumption of drugs was the youth counterculture. The hippie movement, the explosion of rock music closely related with looking for the new ways of inspiration had a huge influence on young people and their behavior. Also, the war in Vietnam had its impact, as many of American young soldiers had their first contact with drugs during their military service in that country. Some of them became addicted after their return to the United States. President Richard Nixon was a conservative politician who could not conciliate with the fact of moral decent of the young generation in the United States. He saw drugs as one of the principal causes of this process. For this reason, in mid-1971, he decided to take important steps toward limiting the scale of the problem. He was, however, conscious of the internal factors of the drug problem in the United States. He was also convinced that the US should undertake a firm offensive toward drug manufacturers in the countries of their origin. In 1971, his administration signed an agreement related to opium plantations and their limitation with Turkey. The same kind of agreement was signed with Mexico in 1973. The Drug Enforcement Agency was created that same year.

However, the most important step of the Nixon administration in its anti-drug policy was the proposal of a broad program dedicated to the drug problem in the United States. The program concentrated both on the problem's internal and external dimension. The idea was very interesting, and some of the recommendations were introduced, however, the reality of the Cold War did not allow for making this an important part of US Latin American policy. Even so, with time Nixon's initiative, and his firm attitude toward the drug problem, took on a symbolic meaning. Nixon is perceived as the initiator of the US 'war on drugs.'

## Richard Nixon, Special Message to the Congress on Drug Abuse Prevention and Control, June 17, 1971

Source: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=3048#ixzz2j7pEniPC> (29.10.2013)

To the Congress of the United States:

In New York City more people between the ages of fifteen and thirty-five years die as a result of narcotics than from any other single cause.

In 1960, less than 200 narcotic deaths were recorded in New York City. In 1970, the figure had risen to over 1,000. These statistics do not reflect a problem indigenous to New York City. Although New York is the one major city in the Nation which has kept good statistics on drug addiction, the problem is national and international. We are moving to deal with it on both levels.

As part of this administration's ongoing efforts to stem the tide of drug abuse which has swept America in the last decade, we submitted legislation in July of 1969 for a comprehensive reform of Federal drug enforcement laws. Fifteen months later, in October, 1970, the Congress passed this vitally-needed legislation, and it is now producing excellent results. Nevertheless, in the fifteen months between the submission of that legislation and its passage, much valuable time was lost.

(...)

### A NEW APPROACH TO REHABILITATION

While experience thus far indicates that the enforcement provisions of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 are effective, they are not sufficient in themselves to eliminate drug abuse. Enforcement must be coupled with a rational approach to the reclamation of the drug user himself. The laws of supply and demand function in the illegal drug business as in any other. We are taking steps under the Comprehensive Drug Act to deal with the supply side of the equation and I am recommending additional steps to be taken now. But we must also deal with demand. We must rehabilitate the drug user if we are to eliminate drug abuse and all the antisocial activities that flow from drug abuse.

(...)

Therefore, I am transmitting legislation to the Congress to consolidate at the highest level a full-scale attack on the problem of drug abuse in America. I am proposing the appropriation of additional funds to meet the cost of rehabilitating drug users, and I will ask for additional funds to increase our enforcement efforts to further tighten the noose around the necks of drug peddlers, and thereby loosen the noose around the necks of drug users.

At the same time I am proposing additional steps to strike at the "supply" side of the drug equation – to halt the drug traffic by striking at the illegal producers of drugs, the growing of those plants from which drugs are derived, and trafficking in these drugs beyond our borders.

America has the largest number of heroin addicts of any nation in the world. And yet, America does not grow opium--of which heroin is a derivative--nor does it manufacture heroin, which is a laboratory process carried out abroad. This deadly poison in the American life stream is, in other words, a foreign import. In the last year, heroin seizures by Federal agencies surpassed the total seized in the previous ten years. Nevertheless, it is estimated that we are stopping less than 20 percent of the drugs aimed at this

Nation. No serious attack on our national drug problem can ignore the international implications of such an effort, nor can the domestic effort succeed without attacking the problem on an international plane. I intend to do that.

#### **A COORDINATED FEDERAL RESPONSE**

(...)

Therefore, I propose the establishment of a central authority with overall responsibility for all major Federal drug abuse prevention, education, treatment, rehabilitation, training, and research programs in all Federal agencies. This authority would be known as the Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention. It would be located within the Executive Office of the President and would be headed by a Director accountable to the President. Because this is an emergency response to a national problem which we intend to bring under control, the Office would be established to operate only for a period of three years from its date of enactment, and the President would have the option of extending its life for an additional two years if desirable.

This Office would provide strengthened Federal leadership in finding solutions to drug abuse problems. It would establish priorities and instill a sense of urgency in Federal and federally-supported drug abuse programs, and it would increase coordination between Federal, State, and local rehabilitation efforts.

(...)

It would concentrate on the "demand" side of the drug equation – the use and the user of drugs.

(...)

#### **REHABILITATION: A NEW PRIORITY**

When traffic in narcotics is no longer profitable, then that traffic will cease. Increased enforcement and vigorous application of the fullest penalties provided by law are two of the steps in rendering narcotics trade unprofitable. But as long as there is a demand, there will be those willing to take the risks of meeting the demand. So we must also act to destroy the market for drugs, and this means the prevention of new addicts, and the rehabilitation of those who are addicted.

To do this, I am asking the Congress for a total of \$105 million in addition to funds already contained in my 1972 budget to be used solely for the treatment and rehabilitation of drug-addicted individuals.

I will also ask the Congress to provide an additional \$10 million in funds to increase and improve education and training in the field of dangerous drugs. This will increase the money available for education and training to more than \$24 million. It has become fashionable to suppose that no drugs are as dangerous as they are commonly thought to be, and that the use of some drugs entails no risk at all. These are misconceptions, and every day we reap the tragic results of these misconceptions when young people are "turned on" to drugs believing that narcotics addiction is something that happens to other people. We need an expanded effort to show that addiction is all too often a one-way street beginning with "innocent" experimentation and ending in death. Between these extremes is the degradation that addiction inflicts on those who believed that it could not happen to them.

(...)

#### **ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT NEEDS**

The Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 provides a sound base for the attack on the problem of the availability of narcotics in America. In addition to tighter and more enforceable regulatory controls, the measure provides law enforcement with stronger and better tools. Equally important, the Act contains credible and

proper penalties against violators of the drug law. Severe punishments are invoked against the drug pushers and peddlers while more lenient and flexible sanctions are provided for the users. A seller can receive fifteen years for a first offense involving hard narcotics, thirty years if the sale is to a minor, and up to life in prison if the transaction is part of a continuing criminal enterprise.

(...)

## **INTERNATIONAL**

(...)

To wage an effective war against heroin addiction, we must have international cooperation. In order to secure such cooperation, I am initiating a worldwide escalation in our existing programs for the control of narcotics traffic, and I am proposing a number of new steps for this purpose.

First, on Monday, June 14, I recalled the United States Ambassadors to Turkey, France, Mexico, Luxembourg, Thailand, the Republic of Vietnam, and the United Nations for consultations on how we can better cooperate with other nations in the effort to regulate the present substantial world opium output and narcotics trafficking. I sought to make it equally clear that I consider the heroin addiction of American citizens an international problem of grave concern to this Nation, and I instructed our Ambassadors to make this clear to their host governments. We want good relations with other countries, but we cannot buy good relations at the expense of temporizing on this problem.

Second, United States Ambassadors to all East Asian governments will meet in Bangkok, Thailand, tomorrow, June 18, to review the increasing problem in that area, with particular concern for the effects of this problem on American servicemen in Southeast Asia.

Third, it is clear that the only really effective way to end heroin production is to end opium production and the growing of poppies. I will propose that as an international goal. It is essential to recognize that opium is, at present, a legitimate source of income to many of those nations which produce it. Morphine and codeine both have legitimate medical applications.

(...)

Fourth, I am requesting \$1 million to be used by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for training of foreign narcotics enforcement officers. Additional personnel within the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs would permit the strengthening of the investigative capacities of BNDD offices in the U.S., as well as their ability to assist host governments in the hiring, training, and deployment of personnel and the procurement of necessary equipment for drug abuse control.

Fifth, I am asking the Congress to amend and approve the International Security Assistance Act of 1971 and the International Development and Humanitarian Assistance Act of 1971 to permit assistance to presently proscribed nations in their efforts to end drug trafficking. The drug problem crosses ideological boundaries and surmounts national differences. If we are barred in any way in our effort to deal with this matter, our efforts will be crippled, and our will subject to question. I intend to leave no room for other nations to question our commitment to this matter.

Sixth, we must recognize that cooperation in control of dangerous drugs works both ways. While the sources of our chief narcotics problem are foreign, the United States is a source of illegal psychotropic drugs which afflict other nations. If we expect other governments to help stop the flow of heroin to our shores, we must act with equal vigor to prevent equally dangerous substances from going into their nations from our own. Accordingly, I am submitting to the Senate for its advice and consent the Convention on Psychotropic Substances which was recently signed by the United States and 22 other nations. In addition, I will submit to the Congress any legislation made necessary by the

Convention including the complete licensing, inspection, and control of the manufacture, distribution, and trade in dangerous synthetic drugs.

Seventh, the United States has already pledged \$2 million to a Special Fund created on April 1 of this year by the Secretary General of the United Nations and aimed at planning and executing a concerted UN effort against the world drug problem. We will continue our strong backing of UN drug-control efforts by encouraging other countries to contribute and by requesting the Congress to make additional contributions to this fund as their need is demonstrated.

(...)

## **CONCLUSION**

Narcotics addiction is a problem which afflicts both the body and the soul of America. It is a problem which baffles many Americans. In our history we have faced great difficulties again and again, wars and depressions and divisions among our people have tested our will as a people – and we have prevailed.

We have fought together in war, we have worked together in hard times, and we have reached out to each other in division – to close the gaps between our people and keep America whole.

The threat of narcotics among our people is one which properly frightens many Americans. It comes quietly into homes and destroys children, it moves into neighborhoods and breaks the fiber of community which makes neighbors. It is a problem which demands compassion, and not simply condemnation, for those who become the victims of narcotics and dangerous drugs. We must try to better understand the confusion and disillusion and despair that bring people, particularly young people, to the use of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

We are not without some understanding in this matter, however. And we are not without the will to deal with this matter. We have the moral resources to do the job. Now we need the authority and the funds to match our moral resources. I am confident that we will prevail in this struggle as we have in many others. But time is critical. Every day we lose compounds the tragedy which drugs inflict on individual Americans. The final issue is not whether we will conquer drug abuse, but how soon. Part of this answer lies with the Congress now and the speed with which it moves to support the struggle against drug abuse.

## **Illegal Drugs as a Threat to National Security and the Certification Procedure**

As Richard Nixon was the first US president that drew attention to the drug problem in the United States, his followers in the White House did not intensify their efforts to struggle with this subject. There were other priorities in American domestic and international policy. It was Ronald Reagan who returned to the problem of illegal drug trafficking and consumption. This coincided with the radical growth of drug consumption in the United States at the end of the 1970s and at the beginning of the 1980s. It was the time when



cocaine and its modification popularly known as crack gained popularity. The Reagan administration undertook several initiatives aimed at combating illegal drugs trafficking to the United States. It is worth mentioning that the First Lady, Nancy Reagan was the person who very actively acted in efforts to limit illegal drug consumption in the United States. During the 1980s, the Reagan administration intensified federal efforts to limit the consumption of drugs, to mention only very controversial laws ordering random drug testing in the workplace. Two very important decisions dedicated to fighting narco-business were adopted during Reagan's presidential terms. Both of them had a significant impact on US relations with other countries of the Western Hemisphere.

In April 1986, President Ronald Reagan signed secret National Security Decision Directive 221. It was the first time that the US authorities singled out illegal drugs as a threat to the national security of the United States. NSDD 221 pointed out that the growing potential of organized crime dedicated to the drug trafficking had the capability of destabilizing some countries that are the most important manufacturers of drugs. This was a particularly real danger in some Latin American and Caribbean countries. Defining drug trafficking as a threat to national security gave some federal institutions additional possibilities and instruments to combat narco-trafficking in countries that were perceived as the major sources of illegal drugs.

The US Congress also adopted Anti-Drug Abuse Act in 1986. Its Title Two was dedicated to the international narcotics control. The most important part of that act was the adoption of new procedures of cooperation and aid for countries perceived as major producers of narcotics – the so called certification procedure. According to the certification procedure, every year, the President has to present the engagement of those countries in combating narco-business on their territories. The certification of a country as a valuable ally in US 'war on drugs' is dependent on that cooperation. Without that certification, a country loses US aid for antidrug activities. The certification procedure is still one of the most important instruments of US anti-drug policy and one of the instruments of US Latin American policy as US authorities used to adopt the procedure not only for the purpose of fighting narco-business but also to carry out its interests in particular States of the region.

## National Security Decision Directive 221, April 8, 1986

Source: <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsdd/nsdd-221.pdf> (5.11.2013)

### Narcotics and National Security (U)

Purpose. To identify the impact of the international narcotics trade upon U.S. national security, and to direct specific actions to increase the effectiveness of U.S. counter-narcotics efforts to enhance our national security. (C)

Background. The expanding scope of global narcotics trafficking has created a situation which today adds another significant dimension to the law enforcement and public health

aspects of this international problem and threatens the national security of the United States.

While the domestic effects of drugs are a serious societal problem for the United States and require the continued aggressive pursuit of law enforcement, health care, and demand reduction programs, the national security threat posed by the drug trade is particularly serious outside U.S. borders. Of primary concern are those nations with a flourishing narcotics industry, where a combination of international criminal trafficking organizations, rural insurgents, and urban terrorists can undermine the stability of the local government; corrupt efforts to curb drug crop production, processing, and distribution; and distort public perception of the narcotics issue in such a way that it becomes part of an anti-U.S. or anti-Western debate.

While these problems are endemic to most nations plagued by narcotics, their effects are particularly insidious for the democratic states of the Western Hemisphere. Moreover, the expansion of narcotics activity creates a regional, as well as a country specific, problem.

A recent National Intelligence Estimate, "The International Drug Trade: Implications for U.S. Security" (NIE 1/8-85) examines the dangers from drug trafficking and highlights the following points:

- The narcotics trade threatens the integrity of democratic governments by corrupting political and judicial institutions. The effect on U.S. interests from such a situation can range from a regime unwilling or unable to cooperate with counter-narcotics programs to a government that is unable to control key areas of its territory and elements of its own judiciary, military, or economy.
- In key drug-producing nations, trafficking organizations have used control of local media to influence public attitudes and impede the ability of local governments to cooperate with U.S. counter-narcotics programs.
- Narcotics activity is inevitably accompanied by a rising rate of violence. This includes crimes by and upon those seeking to buy drugs, against innocent bystanders, between competing trafficking networks, and violence against public officials associated with narcotics control, including U.S. personnel.
- In many countries, the same networks used to smuggle drugs are also employed to bring in illegal weapons.
- Some insurgent groups finance their activities through taxing drug activities, providing protection to local criminal traffickers, or growing their own drug crops. Access to money available from narcotics can have a major impact on the capability of the insurgent forces.
- Some terrorist groups have been linked to drug smuggling primarily to finance their activities. The profits from even one consignment of narcotics could provide small terrorist cells with substantial operating capital.
- Several sovereign states – Cuba, Nicaragua, and Bulgaria, for example – have supported or condoned international drug trafficking for financial or political reasons.
- Policy. The international drug trade threatens the national security of the United States by potentially destabilizing democratic allies. It is therefore the policy of the United States, in cooperation with other nations, to halt the production and flow of illicit narcotics, reduce the ability of insurgent and terrorist groups to use drug trafficking to support their activities, and strengthen the ability of individual governments to confront and defeat this threat.

(...)

## Anti-Drug Abuse Act, October 27, 1986

Public Law 99-570

99<sup>th</sup> Congress

Source: <http://www.unodc.org/doc/enl/1986-30-E.pdf> (5.11.2013)

### An Act

To strengthen Federal efforts to encourage foreign cooperation in eradicating illicit drug crops and in halting international drug traffic, to improve enforcement of Federal drug laws and enhance interdiction of illicit drug shipments, to provide Oct. 27, 1986 strong Federal leadership in establishing effective drug abuse prevention and [H.R. 5484] education programs, to expend Federal support for drug abuse treatment and rehabilitation efforts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986."

(...)

### SEC. 2005. RESTRICTIONS ON THE PROVISION OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE

(a) RESTRICTIONS – Section 481(h) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended to read as follows:

(h)

(1) Subject to paragraph (2), for every major illicit drug producing country or major drug-transit country –

(A) 50 percent of United States assistance allocated for such country notified to Congress in the report required under section 653(a) of this Act shall be withheld from obligation and expenditure; and

(B) on or after March 1, 1987, and on March 1 of each succeeding year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the United States Executive Director of the International Development Association, the United States Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank, and the United States Executive Director of the Asian Development Bank to vote against any loan or other utilization of the funds of their respective institution to or for such country.

(2)

(A) The assistance withheld by paragraph (1)(A) may be obligated and expended and the provisions of paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply if the President determines, and so certifies to the Congress, at the time of the submission of the report required by subsection (e), that –

(i) during the previous year the country has cooperated fully with the United States, or has taken adequate steps on its own, in preventing narcotic and psychotropic drugs and other controlled substances produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country or transported through such country, from being sold illegally within the jurisdiction of such country to United States Government per-

sonnel or their dependents or from being transported, directly or indirectly, into the United States and in preventing and punishing the laundering in that country of drug-related profits or drug-related monies; or

(ii) for a country that would not otherwise qualify for certification under subclause (i), the vital national interests of the United States require the provision of such assistance, or financing.

(B) If the President makes a certification pursuant to clause (A)(ii), he shall include in such certification –

(i) a full and complete description of the vital national interests placed at risk should assistance, or financing not be provided such country; and

(ii) a statement weighing the risk described in subclause (i) against the risks posed to the vital national interests of the United States by the failure of such country to cooperate fully with the United States in combatting narcotics or to take adequate steps to combat narcotics on its own.

(3) In making the certification required by paragraph (2) of this subsection, the President shall give foremost consideration to whether the actions of the government of the country have resulted in the maximum reductions in illicit drug production which were determined to be achievable pursuant to subsection (e)(4). The President shall also consider whether such government –

(A) has taken the legal and law enforcement measures to enforce in its territory, to the maximum extent possible, the elimination of illicit cultivation and the suppression of illicit manufacture of and traffic in narcotic and psychotropic drugs and other controlled substances, as evidenced by seizures of such drugs and substances and of illicit laboratories and the arrest and prosecution of violators involved in the traffic in such drugs and substances significantly affecting the United States; and

(B) has taken the legal and law enforcement steps necessary to eliminate, to the maximum extent possible, the laundering in that country of drug-related profits or drug-related monies, as, evidence by –

(i) the enactment and enforcement of laws prohibiting such conduct, and

(ii) the willingness of such government to enter into mutual legal assistance agreements with the United States governing (but not limited to) money laundering, and

(iii) the degree to which such government otherwise cooperates with United States law enforcement authorities on anti-money laundering efforts.

(4)

(A) The provisions of paragraph (1) shall apply without regard to paragraph (2) if the Congress enacts, within 30 days of continuous session after receipt of a certification under paragraph (2), a joint resolution disapproving the determination of the President contained in such certification.

(B)

(i) Any such joint resolution shall be considered in the Senate in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

(ii) For the purpose of expediting the consideration and enactment of joint resolution under this subsection, a motion to proceed to the consideration of any such joint resolution after it has been reported by the appropriate committee shall be treated as highly privileged in the House of Representatives.

(5) Any country for which the President has not made a certification under paragraph (2) or with respect to which the Congress has enacted a joint resolution disapproving such

certification may not receive United States assistance as defined by subsection (i)(4) of this section or the financing described in paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection unless –

(A) the President makes a certification under paragraph (2) and the Congress does not enact a joint resolution of disapproval; or

(B) the President submits at any other time a certification of the matters described in paragraph (2) with respect to such country and the Congress enacts, in accordance with the procedures of paragraph (4), a joint resolution approving such certification.

(...)

## Plan Colombia, 2000

As Bill Clinton assumed the presidency in the United States, he announced some significant changes in the American ‘war on drugs.’ His most important objective was placing more attention on cooperation with those Latin American countries that were the largest sources of illegal drugs. Also, the Clinton administration wanted to limit the role of the military struggle with the narco-business and intensify US aid aimed at economic help to initiate an alternative for the peasants who were cultivating coca, marijuana or opium. However, relations between the United States and Colombia during the Clinton presidency were very tense. Firstly, President Clinton refused cooperation with Colombian President Ernesto Samper after the accusation about using money from a drug cartel during his presidential campaign. The most important result of the worsening bilateral relations was the lack of certification for Colombia in 1996 and 1997. This was an excellent example of using the certification procedure as an instrument of US foreign policy, as in the same time the Samper administration had significant success in limiting the coca cultivation area in Colombia. He also carried out a successful campaign against drug cartels in Colombia. It was Samper’s administration that led to the destruction of the Cali Cartel, one of the most powerful drug cartels at the turn of the 1980s and 1990s.

Clinton’s policy toward Colombia changed after the election of Andres Pastrana as the president of Colombia. As the 1990s were the time of reinforcement of the most important Colombian guerilla – *Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia* (FARC) – the new president was looking for new possibilities of American aid in the peace process. One of his initiatives was a program of broad cooperation with the United States to quit the decades long armed conflict in Colombia. The Pastrana administration prepared such a cooperation program and proposed it to the US authorities. In the United States’ opinion, Colombia’s main problem was narco-business not the guerilla movement, so the Clinton administration significantly changed the main objective of the program known as *Plan Colombia: Plan for Peace, Prosperity and Strengthening of the State*. In fact, it was a completely different project than the one prepared by President Pastrana. It was – to a significant degree – a return to the militarization of the American

‘war on drugs’ in Colombia, as the main part of the US aid for Colombia was dedicated to strengthening the Colombian police forces and military aid for Colombian armed forces. From the general sum of USD 830 million, more than USD 500 million was in the form of military aid. More than USD 120 million was dedicated to the Colombian police force. In comparison, for alternative development – that includes aid for peasants in the process of changing coca cultivation for other crops – the program provided less than USD 70 million. This distribution of US aid in the frame of Plan Colombia explicitly confirmed its return to the militarization of the American antidrug policy in Latin American countries. The final version of the Plan Colombia had completely different goals than Pastrana’s proposal. According to the final version, the main objective was the strengthening of the antidrug policy in Colombia and combating narco-business meanwhile the aim of the Pastrana initiative was a program of ending the armed conflict in Colombia. After the US Congress approval the Plan in July 2000, Colombia became the third recipient of US military aid in the world, just behind Israel and Egypt.

### Plan Colombia: Plan for Peace, Prosperity, and the Strengthening of the State

Source: [http://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/file/resources/collections/peace\\_agreements/plan\\_colombia\\_101999.pdf](http://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/file/resources/collections/peace_agreements/plan_colombia_101999.pdf) (07.11.2013)

#### **Preface**

As Colombia stands both proud and threatened on the threshold of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we are faced with the historic challenge of establishing and securing a society where the Colombian state can exercise its true authority and fulfill its essential obligations, as stated in our Constitution:

“(...) to serve the community, promote prosperity and guarantee the principles, rights and duties as consecrated in the Constitution; to facilitate the participation of the people in the decisions that affect them and the economic, political, administrative and cultural life of the Nation; to defend our independence, maintain our territorial integrity and assure peaceful coexistence and a just order.”

All these objectives are at stake today. The chief responsibility for us in government is to build a better, more secure country for this generation and future ones to make the Colombian state a more effective force for domestic tranquility, prosperity and progress. We need to build a state for Social Justice, which will protect all of our citizens, and uphold all their rights to life, dignity and property, freedom of belief, opinion and the press.

To make this fundamental idea a reality for Colombia, we must meet and master difficult and ever-changing national and international conditions. We face issues raised by the international economy and others posed by the history and evolution of our own country. The decisive challenges for Colombia come from the spread of drug-trafficking, and the economic, political and social impact of globalization.

There is no question that Colombia suffers from the problems of a state yet to consolidate its power: a lack of confidence in the capacity of the armed forces, the police, and the judicial system to guarantee order and security; a credibility crisis at different levels and in different agencies of government; and corrupt practices in the public and the pri-

vate sectors. All this has been fed and aggravated by the enormous destabilizing effects of drug trafficking, which, with vast economic resources, has constantly generated indiscriminate violence while undermining our values, on a scale comparable only to the era of Prohibition in the United States.

At the same time, the Colombian economy, despite forty years of continuous growth, has not been able to bring the benefits of prosperity to the majority of our people; nor has it been able significantly to reduce poverty levels. The violence and corruption fuelled by drug trafficking generate distrust among foreign investors, putting a major roadblock in the path of modernizing the way things work, which is essential for generating employment and securing a stable and prosperous place for Colombia in a newly globalized world.

In short, the hopes of the Colombian people and the work of the Colombian government have been frustrated by drug trafficking, which makes it extremely difficult for the government to fulfill its constitutional duty. A vicious and pervasive cycle of violence and corruption has drained the resources essential to the construction and success of a modern State.

We understand that reaching our objectives will depend on a social and governmental process that may take several years a time when it is critical to achieve a lasting consensus within a Colombian society where people understand and demand their rights, but are also willing to abide by their responsibilities.

In the face of all this, my government is absolutely committed to strengthen the State, regain the confidence of our citizens, and restore the basic norms of a peaceful society. Attaining peace is not a matter of will alone. Peace must be built; it can come only through stabilizing the State, and enhancing its capacity to guarantee each and every citizen, throughout the entire country, their security and the freedom to exercise their rights and liberties.

Negotiation with the insurgents, which my government initiated, is at the core of our strategy because it is one critical way to resolve a forty-year old historic conflict that raises enormous obstacles to creating the modern and progressive state Colombia so urgently needs to become. The search for peace and the defense of democratic institutions will require long effort, faith and determination, to deal successfully with the pressures and doubts inherent in so difficult a process.

The fight against drug trafficking constitutes another important part of Plan Colombia. The strategy would advance a partnership between consumer and producer countries, based on the principles of reciprocity and equality. The traffic in illicit drugs is clearly a transnational and complex threat, destructive to all our societies, with enormous consequences for those who consume this poison, and enormous effects from the violence and corruption fed by the immense revenues the drug trade generates. The solution will never come from finger-pointing by either producer or consumer countries. Our own national efforts will not be enough unless they are part of a truly international alliance against illegal drugs.

Colombia has demonstrated its absolute commitment and made heavy sacrifices to forge a definitive solution to the phenomenon of drug trafficking, to the armed conflict, human rights violations and destruction of the environment caused by drug production. Yet, in truth, we must acknowledge that more than twenty years after marijuana cultivation came to Colombia, along with increased cocaine and poppy cultivation, drug trafficking continues to grow as a destabilizing force, distorting the economy, reversing the advances made in land distribution, corrupting society, multiplying violence, depressing the investment climate and most seriously, providing increased resources to fund all armed groups.

Colombia has been leading the global battle against drugs, taking on the drug cartels and losing many of our best citizens in the process. Now, as drug trafficking becomes a more fragmented network, more internationalized, underground, and thus harder to combat,

the world continues testing new strategies. More resources are being targeted for education and prevention. We see the results in the increased confiscation and expropriation of profits and properties obtained from illegal drug trafficking. In Colombia, we have recently launched operations to destroy processing laboratories and distribution networks. We are improving and tightening security and control of our rivers and airspace to assure better interdiction, and we are exploring new ways to eradicate illegal crops. The factors directly related to drug trafficking like money laundering, smuggling of chemicals, and illegal arms trafficking are components of a multifaceted problem that must be dealt with across the globe, wherever illicit drugs are produced, transported, or consumed.

Our success also requires reforms at the very heart of our institutions, in particular, in our military forces to uphold the law and return a sense of security to all Colombians everywhere in Colombia. Strong, responsible, responsive military and police forces committed to peace and respect for human rights are indispensable to consolidating and maintaining the rule of law. Also, we need and we are committed to securing a modern and effective judicial system sworn to defend and promote respect for human rights. We will be tireless in this cause, convinced that our first obligation as a government is to guarantee that our citizens can exercise their rights and fundamental liberties, free from fear.

But Colombia's strategy for peace and progress also depends on reforming and modernizing other institutions so the political process can function as an effective instrument of economic advancement and social justice. To make progress here, we have to reduce the causes and provocations of violence, by opening new paths to social participation and creating a collective conscience which holds government accountable for results. Here our strategy includes a specific initiative to guarantee, within five years, full access for all our people to education and on adequate healthcare system, with special attention for the most vulnerable and neglected. In addition, we plan to strengthen local governments, in order to make them more sensitive and responsive to the needs and will of our citizens. We will also encourage active grassroots participation in our fight against corruption, kidnapping, violence, and the displacement of people and communities.

Finally, Colombia requires aid to strengthen its economy and generate employment. Our country needs better and fairer access to markets where our products can compete. Assistance from the United States, the European Community and the rest of the international community is vital to our economic development. That development, in turn, is a critical counter force to drug trafficking, because it brings alternative legal employment, for individuals who might otherwise be lost to organized crime or to the insurgent groups that feed off drug-trafficking. We are convinced that the first step toward meaningful worldwide globalization is to create a sense of global solidarity. This is why Colombia is asking for support from its partners. We cannot succeed without programs for alternative development in rural areas, and easier international access for our legitimate exports. This is the only way to successfully offset the illegal drug trade.

There are reasons to be optimistic about the future of Colombia, especially if we receive a positive response from the world community, as we work to create widespread prosperity combined with justice. This will make it possible for Colombians to pave the way to a lasting peace.

The Spanish philosopher Miguel de Unamuno wrote: "Faith is not to believe in the invisible, but rather to create the invisible." Today, a peaceful, progressive, drug-free Colombia is an invisible ideal but we are determined to make it the reality of our future. With the full commitment of all our resources and resolve, with the solidarity and assistance of our international partners in the common fight against the plague of drug trafficking, we can and will forge the new reality of a modern, democratic, and peaceful Colombia, not just surviving, but thriving in the new millennium as a proud and dignified member of the world community.



### **Plan Colombia: Plan for Peace, Prosperity, and the Strengthening of the State**

At the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, Colombia faces the challenge of consolidating the state's central responsibilities. It must recover confidence among its citizens, and in so doing, the basic canons of coexistence in society. The commitment of the government is to recover the State's central responsibilities: the promotion of democracy, a monopoly of the application of justice, territorial integrity, the generation of conditions for employment, respect for human rights and human dignity and the preservation of public order.

The destabilizing forces of drug trafficking have aggravated the weaknesses of a State still engaged in a process of consolidation. Progressive reforms introduced in the 1990s heralded an age of increased opportunity for Colombians, but they were distorted and penetrated by corrupting influences in economic and political circles; they fostered violence and corruption. More recently, the financial relationship between the various armed groups and the drug traffickers has contributed to the intensification of the armed conflict and limited the capacity of the State to discharge its major responsibilities.

The recovery of this capacity of the State requires a process of community and institution building. In this sense, peace is not a question of political will alone. Rather, peace needs to be built up gradually, and therefore there must be progress in the institutionalization and strengthening of the State in order to guarantee security and respect for rights and freedoms for all citizens, in every corner of Colombia.

Central to the strategy are the negotiations with the guerrillas, which seek to put an end to conflicts that have undergone a profound change over the last 40 years. If the strategy is successful, it will not only greatly facilitate the process of construction of society: a negotiated peace agreement with the guerrillas on the basis of territorial integrity, democracy and human rights would strengthen the rule of law and the fight against drugs.

At the same time, however, peace also requires strong and viable economic activities so that people can improve their social and economic conditions, thus creating an environment for a lasting reconciliation. An economic strategy complemented by an alternative development strategy has been proposed by the government to accomplish these goals and to provide incentives to reduce illicit crops. It aims to promote new economic activities and alternative agricultural activities, with attention also devoted to the recovery of the environment and the protection of fragile ecosystems threatened by illicit crops. The strategy builds on participatory schemes involving the private sector, the state and beneficiaries through a demand-oriented strategy linked to national and international markets.

Another central thrust of the strategy is the formation of a collective vision between consumer, producer and all other countries involved in the illicit drug chain, addressing basic principles of reciprocity and equality. This alliance should enable a concerted response to be made to the threats of the illicit drug trade, one of the most profitable activities in the world. In Colombia drug trafficking has not only bred corruption within society and diminished confidence in legitimate commercial activities – it also feeds the conflict. It represents an internationalized source of finance for the various armed groups, and helps them to build up economic and territorial influence. In Colombia and abroad, through the preparation and application of an integrated strategy to combat the principal elements responsible for the cultivation of illicit crops, the fight against trafficking will achieve positive results that will benefit both Colombia and the rest of the world.

Colombia has demonstrated a commitment to address the related problems of armed conflict, drug trafficking, human rights violations and environmental degradation. Nevertheless, Colombia is facing the worst economic crisis in its history. Frustratingly, the government's capacity to solve its problems is specially limited at a time when violence, intensified by drug trafficking, is on the increase.

### Elements of the plan:

1. An economic strategy that generates employment, supports the ability of the State to collect tax revenues and allows the country to have a viable counterbalancing economic force to narco-trafficking. The expansion of international trade, accompanied by enhanced access to foreign markets and free trade agreements to attract foreign and domestic investment are key to the modernization of our economic base and to job creation. Such a strategy is crucial at a time when Colombia is confronting its worst economic crisis in seventy years, with unemployment reaching 20%, which in turn greatly limits the government's ability to confront drug trafficking and the violence it generates.
2. A fiscal and financial strategy that includes tough austerity and adjustment measures, in order to boost economic activity and recover the historically excellent prestige of Colombia in international financial markets.
3. A peace strategy that aims at a negotiated peace agreement with the guerrillas on the basis of territorial integrity, democracy and human rights, which should further strengthen the rule of law and the fight against drugs.
4. A national defense strategy to restructure and modernize the armed forces and the police, so that they will be able to restore the rule of law and provide security throughout the country, to combat organized crime and armed groups and to protect and promote human rights and international humanitarian law.
5. A judicial and human rights strategy to reaffirm the rule of law and assure equal and impartial justice to all, while pressing ahead with the reforms already initiated in the forces of law and order to ensure that they play their proper role in defending and respecting the rights and dignity of all.
6. A counter-narcotics strategy, in partnership with other countries involved in some or all of the links of the drug-chain: production, distribution, sale, consumption, asset laundering, precursor chemicals and arms dealing. And, at the national level, to stop the flow of drug-money the fuel of violence – to the insurgent and other armed organizations.
7. An alternative development strategy that will promote agricultural schemes and other profitable economic activities for peasant-farmers and their families. Alternative development will also consider economically-feasible environmental protection activities, designed to conserve the forest areas and end the dangerous expansion of illegal crops across the Amazon basin and Colombia's vast natural parks-areas of immense bio-diversity, of vital environmental importance to the international community. Within this framework the strategy includes sustainable, integrated and participatory productive projects combined with the required infrastructure. Particular attention is paid to regions which combine high levels of conflict with low levels of State presence, fragile social capital and serious environmental degradation, such as the Middle Magdalena valley, the Macizo Colombiano and the south-west.
8. A social participation strategy aimed at collective awareness. This strategy seeks to develop more accountability in local government, community involvement in anti-corruption efforts, and continued pressure on the guerrillas and other armed groups to end kidnapping, violence and the internal displacement of individuals and communities. This strategy will also include cooperation with local business and labor groups, in order to promote innovative and productive models in the face of a more globalized economy and thus strengthen our agricultural communities and reduce the risks of rural violence. In addition, this strategy seeks to strengthen institutions, both formal and informal, to foster changes in the cultural patterns through which violence develops and reinforces itself. It includes the promotion of mechanisms and educational programs to increase tolerance, the essential values for peaceful co-existence, and participation in public affairs.

9. A human development strategy to promote efforts to guarantee, within the next few years, adequate education and health, to provide opportunities to every young Colombian and to help vulnerable groups in our society, including not just those affected and displaced by violence but also those in conditions of extreme poverty.

10. An international-oriented strategy to confirm the principles of shared responsibility, integrated action and balanced treatment of the drug issue. The role and support of the international community is also vital to the success of the peace process provided that it conforms to the terms of international law and is requested by the Colombian government.

(...)

### **Counter-drug strategy**

The Colombian Government has made the fight against drug production and trafficking one of its top strategic priorities. Narcotics are a threat not only to the internal security of the nation but also to people in both consumer and producer nations.

Drug trafficking, because of its huge profits and its destabilizing power, is one of the central factors generating violence throughout Colombia. For this reason the government must focus significant attention on this problem and is determined to combat narcotics, in terms of drug trafficking, production, consumption and any other elements that support this illicit activity, which threatens the democratic institutions and the integrity of our nation.

The strengthening of the police and the armed forces through its modernization, restructuring and professionalization is crucial to make them more capable of reestablishing the rule of law, restoring security to Colombians throughout the nation, and halting the penetration of irregular groups and organized crime especially those associated with drug trafficking.

The National Government of the Republic of Colombia is committed to implement a long-term National Counternarcotics strategy, on outline of which follows:

### **Strategy based on human values**

The army and police will base their conduct on preservation of democratic liberties and the defense of life, honor and property of citizens. The strategy will give priority to promoting respect for and protection of human rights of all.

The phenomenon of internal violence leads to instability caused by four violence-generating agents – groups or organizations which carry out aggressive actions leading to physical, psychological, economic, social and political violence: narco-trafficking organizations, subversive groups, illegal “self defense” groups and common criminals.

Although the guerrilla movements have their roots in Colombia’s rural areas and, at least in part in ideological confrontation, over time their fight to expand territorial control has been financed by extortion and other illegal activities. At least 30% of their income now comes from charges placed on coca leaf and paste obtained from intermediaries in the growing areas.

The drug trade is currently a destabilizing element for all democratic societies, providing immense sums of money for illegal armed groups. The drug trade has dangerous multiplier effects, including funds earned from growing, processing and trafficking, all of which have contributed to a notable increase in the numbers and firepower of the armed groups.

Guerrillas and illegal “self-defense” groups threaten the State by endeavoring to control sovereign territory, through the disruption of order by raids, kidnaps, roadblocks and terrorist attacks. The traffickers rely on coca and opium poppy crops in remote areas beyond government control – both trafficking and processing occur in southern Colombia

where there is a strong guerrilla presence. As long as this independent source of drugs and revenue remains beyond the control of the forces of law and order, the guerrillas, the illegal "self-defense" groups and the traffickers will only grow stronger and prove a greater threat to the State.

## Merida Initiative

Since the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the main front of the 'war on drugs' is placed in Mexico. As the biggest Colombian drug cartels were destroyed in the 1990s and the small ones that replaced the Cali Cartel or the Medellín Cartel do not have enough capabilities to carry out massive drug trafficking to the United States, they used the services of Mexican cartels that gained a very strong position at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century. The existence of the narco-business in Mexico is not a new situation. It has a long tradition dating back to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. However, for the majority of this period, the Mexican authorities from the PRI party gave informal permission for the functioning of organizations that smuggled drugs into the United States. After several large scandals at the end of 20<sup>th</sup> century (including accusing President Carlos Salinas de Gortari's brother, Raul, of participating in narco-business) the new non-PRI authorities decided to stop this policy of informal tolerance. It was President Felipe Calderón Hinojosa (2006–2012) that declared war on narco-business in Mexico. This resulted in a huge wave of violence in that country. The drug cartels are not only fighting each other for control of the routes of smuggling drugs to the United States but the State is also fighting with cartels. In effect, since 2006 an unprecedented growth of violence and homicides can be observed. The total number of victims during this war on drugs in Mexico surpassed 60,000 people in 2013.

Undoubtedly, the Mexican authorities cannot resolve the problem of narco-business and the eruption of violence that accompanies it. It is the main transfer country for the illegal drugs that enter the United States. In effect, the fight against narco-business in this country is also crucial for the US authorities. This is why the governments of both countries have cooperated for many years, to resolve that situation. However, the intensification of the drug war since 2006 and the eruption of a huge wave of violence was the factor that gave a solid impulse for the significant strengthening of this collaboration. As the activity of Mexican drug cartels constitutes a growing threat to the US security, American government decided to intensify its engagement in the Mexican drug war. In effect, in March 2007 President Felipe Calderón and President George W. Bush announced, in Merida, a significant strengthening of cooperation between the two countries and significant US aid for the Mexican government in its fight against narco-business. This is commonly known as the Merida Initiative. In the framework of that cooperation, the United States is currently providing technical expertise and assistance

to Mexico for police professionalization, prosecutorial capacity building, judicial and prison reform, justice sector institution building, information technology enhancement, infrastructure development, and border security. More than one-third of a billion dollars worth of equipment and assistance has been delivered to Mexican government agencies through the end of 2010, with approximately another USD 500 million scheduled for delivery in 2011. The primary goals of the Mérida Initiative are: to break the power and impunity of criminal organizations, to assist the Mexican and Central American governments in strengthening border, air, and maritime controls, to improve the capacity of the justice systems in the region, and to curtail gang activity in Mexico and Central America as well as diminish the demand for drugs in the region. This is the largest US aid program dedicated to Latin American countries since the Plan Colombia.

### Joint Statement by the United States of America and Mexico, March 14, 2007, Merida, Mexico

Source: Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George W. Bush (2007, Book I), the U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 314–316

Mexico and the United States, as proud and sovereign countries, today reiterate their conviction that the shared values of democracy, transparency, rule of law, and respect for human rights are the solid foundation on which the increasingly rich and complex networks that link their economies and societies are based.

Presidents Felipe Calderon and George Bush resolved during their first official meeting in Mexico on March 13 and 14, 2007 in Merida, Yucatan, to strengthen the partnership between two friendly neighbors. They agreed that government to government relations are but one small measure of the interaction between our two great countries. Our ties are deeper and wider: they are societal, economic, cultural, and familial.

During their meeting, the Presidents reviewed the wide range of issues of the bilateral relationship and the cooperation undertaken by their governments in order to promote productive and mutually beneficial relations between Mexico and the United States. The Presidents identified new opportunities to work together in order to improve the quality of life of their peoples as well as to make North America the most prosperous, secure and competitive region in the world.

In this vein, the Presidents acknowledged that economic growth and job creation are vital to reducing poverty and inequality and improving the quality of life. They emphasized the centrality of expanding trade between the United States and Mexico as the basis for our shared prosperity. They recognized the need for our governments to work together to speed and facilitate the secure and ever-expanding movement of legitimate goods and people across our shared border, including the development of new infrastructure and the more efficient use of existing infrastructure, where possible.

In seeking to enhance North American competitiveness based on the twin pillars of security and prosperity, the Presidents also underscored their awareness regarding the need to work together to facilitate the transition to full free trade in such areas as agricultural products. To this end, the Presidents agreed to intensify the discussions within the framework of the bilateral working group on corn and dry beans.

The Presidents recognized the continued threat to both nations posed by organized crime and drug trafficking, especially their associated violence, which do not respect borders. They underlined that the important efforts of the Mexican Government to confront organized crime head-on, as one of the most important priorities of its own domestic agenda, would benefit from increased support from and cooperation with the United States. In this connection, they reiterated their commitment to intensify cooperation and information sharing between the law enforcement agencies of Mexico and the United States, especially along the border region. The Presidents stressed their commitment to increase bilateral cooperation to target criminal organizations, fight arms trafficking, which fuels the violence of criminal organizations, as well as drug trafficking, including methamphetamine and precursor chemicals, and illicit financial activities, including bulk currency smuggling across our borders.

The management of the U.S.-Mexican border is a shared responsibility. Our common fight against organized crime must be accompanied by cooperative actions in other areas which will also promote the security, prosperity and well-being of our border communities. Improved communication and information-sharing at all levels will allow us to continue to transform the border into a region of growing and shared prosperity.

Recognizing that the border region encompasses a remarkable diversity in landscape and native species, the Presidents acknowledged the need to continue efforts to protect our shared natural resources, including air and water, through binational cooperation.

The Presidents recognized that immigration across our common border vitally links both countries, involves shared responsibilities, and represents one of the most critical issues for the future well-being of both our peoples. In this regard they underscored the need to encourage productive investment aimed at creating more and better paid jobs in Mexico as an essential component of any comprehensive strategy to address this phenomenon and agreed on the need to continue advocating an approach to comprehensive immigration reform.

The Presidents also agreed to explore opportunities for people-to-people exchanges, especially in education, as a central tool in fostering greater understanding between our two countries. In this context they stressed that the investment Mexico and the United States make in human capital must be considered an essential component of their efforts to promote North America's competitiveness and economic growth with justice and security for our peoples.

Finally, Presidents Calderon and Bush reiterated their conviction that the future of Mexico and the United States – and of the whole North American region – is now, more than ever, a shared future. Our commitment to the advancement of democracy, the respect for human rights, the promotion of free markets, the rule of law, security, sustainable development, and expanding opportunity for all, they underlined, will contribute to the consolidation of a prosperous, just, and peaceful future for all citizens in the Americas.

In the series **Basic American Documents** were released:

Paweł Laidler, *Basic Cases in U.S. Constitutional Law: The Separation of Powers*, Kraków 2005.

Łukasz Wordliczek, *U.S. Foreign Policy: Procedure and Substance*, Kraków 2005.

Robert Kłosowicz, *Basic Cases in U.S. History: For the Colonies to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, Kraków 2006.

Paweł Laidler, *Basic Cases in U.S. Constitutional Law: Rights and Liberties*, Kraków 2009.

TECHNICAL EDITOR

*Agnieszka Steplewska*

PROOFREADER

*Małgorzata Szul*

TYPESETTING

*Wojciech Wojewoda*

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego  
Redakcja: ul. Michałowskiego 9/2, 31-126 Kraków  
tel. 12-663-23-81, 12-663-23-82, fax 12-663-23-83